

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_96473</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bio accessibility of trace elements in different oyster mushroom varieties grown in Kenya</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	If I think it's appropriate	
2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	Yes	
4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, however, I consider that other sections can be included (in the materials and methods section)	
5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>	Yes, I consider it, although there are some details that can be improved	
6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	The number of references is adequate (96 references), however, only 19 of 96 are from 2010 onwards and 48 of 96 are less than 2000.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	In general, it is adequate, easy to understand, however homogenize some words, in the document in length to make the observations	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is necessary to review the document in full (address comments)	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Lucio González Montiel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Food Technology, Universidad de la Cañada, México</b>