

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_92526
Title of the Manuscript:	Economically important wild mushrooms of Bonai Forest Division, Odisha, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title: Very broad, I believe that research should be more restricted given that the objective " Economically important wild mushrooms of Bonai Forest Division, Odisha, India "will be in line with what was developed.</p> <p>The survey work was carried out from 2021 to 2022 in Bonai Forest Division, Odisha, India. Bonai Forest Division is located between 21° 39' 8" N 85° 30' 23" E towards the North-Western boundary of Sundargarh district of the state [6]. The authors different local markets, state highways visited, district roads, village roads, and tribal villages to collect information regarding wild edible mushrooms and their economic values from the sellers, villagers, and local communities. The mushrooms are identified using the available literature [6-11]</p> <p>Introduction: The authors problematized, but did not evidence the research problem or research question to be answered by this research</p> <p>No theoretical basis or support was presented, only in the introduction. I think it would be interesting to at least add previous works if they exist, to show the contribution of the research.</p> <p>Discussion: The researchers seek to collect and tabulate the data but did not evidence the contribution of the research if they meet the intersection of previous works, the authors could discuss the results with these works, thus showing how the research contributes scientifically, since, in In a practical way, this was well evidenced. I recommend, if possible, still rotating the model based on the given recommendation to evidence whether the model responses used evidence enhancement and enhancement.</p> <p>Conclusions: Present the answer to the research problem: Present how the research problem was answered, that is, identify that the problem was solved and what is the evidence that it was solved (whether theoretical or empirical).</p> <p>Submit contribution: Clearly explain how the research contributes to the area.</p> <p>Present limitations: Difficulties encountered during the search process</p> <p>Current recommendations for future research: Present based on the limitations of the search options that may occur in the face of the difficulties encountered.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	MATERIALS AND METHODS: Broad intervention instrument, perhaps restricting what is necessary and informing readers where they can be analyzed in greater detail, thus explaining the procedures of how it was carried out	
Optional/General comments	English review for grammar and spellin	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sérgio Murilo Petri
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil