

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105701
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of surface sterilization techniques and different quantities of paddy straw for improving the biological efficiency of paddy straw mushroom
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is. Still, it needs more improvements in terms of detail, clarity, and conciseness of the paper. 2. The title should be slightly changed because according to the treatments specified in the method section, there was no only steam sterilization. So the title cannot be used with the phrase "sterilization techniques". This is because it means plurality. 3. The abstract was not good enough because it lacks a lot of information such as the objectives of the study, the place and time of the experiment, and the statistical tests used for this experiment. Please consider rewriting that in a concise, but informative way. 4. The subsections are properly divided, but still, the important information inside is missing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the introduction, it is well written, but there are no references at all. It is suggested that the author uses enough citations to support the statements made in the introduction. Besides that, the overall and specific objectives should be specified under this section, probably at the end of its last paragraph to convince the reader of the importance of the study and the purpose of doing the experiment. - In the method, the author specifies the place where the experiment was but does not mention the period of the study. This information should be added. Besides that, the way the author writes the treatments is not clear enough; therefore, it is suggested the author should describe the treatments and the replicates in a simpler way that is more understandable. Besides that, statistical tests and software needed for the data analysis are important to compare means properly in this study. So, it is advised that the author should consider writing down those parts appropriately. - In the results and the discussion, the author uses graphs and tables to show the results, but the way the author writes the table description is a bit tricky. Normally, the description is written outside the table. However, in this case, it is written on the first. So, please refer to the journal guideline to write the description properly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regarding the graphs, the numbering is not considered appropriate yet between two graphs are clustered horizontally, but they have their description below. So, the best way is to number them separately. Please double-check that and rewrite it properly. o Regarding the way of writing the number and its unit, there are some errors in such writing because sometimes the author writes down the number and its unit directly without spacing, and sometimes there is spacing. The right way to leave spacing, except for the percentage that does not require spacing. o It can be seen that the discussion part is missing; therefore, the author is advised to discuss the result with previous or similar studies done by other researchers. - In the conclusion, it seems that the author repeats the result written in the results and discussion section. It is advised that the conclusion should be more considered, mentioning only the main results and providing some suggestions or recommendations for future studies. 5. Yes, it is, but it needs improving according to the comments directly given on the reviewed manuscript. 6. In terms of references, they are not enough because the whole introduction does not contain any references. Therefore, it is advised that the author should make as many citations as possible to support the study and state its importance. 7. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Regarding the writing, there are some mistakes in using punctuation, subject-verb agreements, and proper sentence writing. Still, these errors can be eradicated if the author addresses the comments properly and carefully.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be considered for publication, but what should be done next is ensure that the author has to address and respond to the comments properly and with care.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Lyhour Hin
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia