

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_105770
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional potential of two species of mushroom edible by the Tem and Kabyè peoples living along the Alédjo wildlife reserve: <i>Pleurotus tuber-regium</i> (Fr.) Fr and <i>Cantharellus platyphyllus</i> Heinem
Type of the 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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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>1. Introduction- with enough information, with a systematic review of the major related articles. References seem quite outdated; are there not other studies, even with different objectives that may interest in this case?</p> <p>Material and methods- With logic and interesting nutritional results</p> <p>Conclusions- based on the data and references used</p> <p>2. I believe the title is too big; I believe it could be improved and shortened</p> <p>3. Results can be written in a more elegant way since they are written in an overlapping way</p> <p>4. Yes, they are.</p> <p>5. Yes, in general</p> <p>6. References seem quite outdated. There are many recent interesting articles in mushrooms recently published that should be included.</p> <p>Figure 2 should be in better conditions. Is it really essential?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>2.2.1. the first paragraph should be rewritten. The overall document is quite understandable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	M. Joao Reis Lima
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Institute Viseu, Portugal