

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_96473
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio accessibility of trace elements in different oyster mushroom varieties grown in Kenya
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important in the Community particularly in Health Sciences because they will have an idea on the amount of Vanadium, Chromium and Selenium in Mushrooms and the bioaccessibility of those.</p> <p>The title is specific and that is good.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but with few grammatical errors which should be corrected.</p> <p>Some parts of the manuscripts should be deleted (i.e. the table for ANOVA results). The results and discussion on the analysis (ANOVA) should be part of the table with the results that used ANOVA for analysis.</p> <p>The manuscript itself is scientifically correct. Some of the references are way older and the author/s may look for the recent ones (i.e. from 2013- present)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript should be checked by a grammarian or an English editor for correct spelling and grammar.	
Optional/General comments	The research has an impact on the health of the community.	

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 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leilidyn Y. Zurbano
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic University of the Philippines Lopez, Philippines