

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_102595
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Morchella esculenta use in the environmentally friendly synthesis of silver nanoparticles in Thannamandi District (J and K), India
Type of the Article	Review 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://journalajrib.com/index.php/AJRIB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but it should be revised.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but it should be revised.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is an interesting manuscript focused on the green synthesis of silver nanoparticles using a fungi extract. It merits to be published; however please consider the following comments and suggestions: i) in the abstract there is missing insights of results. ii) check the redaction in the introduction. There is missing connectors. As well check length of subsections related. iii) in the section of results there is missing graphs and tables .iv) the English used should be revised. V) please check the order of sections. The objectives should go first.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Bracamonte
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentina