

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_109304
Title of the Manuscript:	Revolutionizing Mushroom Cultivation: A Comprehensive Review of Hydroponics in Fungiculture
Type of the Article	Review Article

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>Theme selection: Very important Summary: Clear and comprehensible Introduction: Rich enough Subtitles: In the subtitle "Importance of mushroom farming," which I've highlighted in green in the manuscript, you can see a paragraph of almost 22 lines with only one bibliographic reference! Therefore, it is necessary to cite all the references and enrich this paragraph. Also, in the same paragraph, there is a photo labeled "Pic 1. Mushroom farming"!!!! It's a blatant copy-paste, utterly unacceptable, and makes no sense.</p> <p>In addition, in the subtitles "Mushroom therapeutic value," "Mushroom Nutritional value," "Social and Economic importance,"till "Nutrient requirements for hydroponic mushroom farming," I see small paragraphs that seem like they were copied and pasted, with only one bibliographic reference in each paragraph! This is not at all scientific.</p> <p>I am also dissatisfied with the rest of the document, whether in terms of formatting or the synthesis method.</p> <p>s Conclusion:</p> <p>Bibliography: "With more than 25 references consulted, the manuscript is considered rich in bibliography, including recent articles dating from 2022, 2023, etc."s comment It appears that the photos and images are simply copied from the internet, and I do not sense any innovation or effort from the author.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Clear and acceptable	
Optional/General 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Boukerker Hassen
Department, University & Country	Scientific and Technical Research Center on Arid Regions, Algeria