

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105748
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Different Non-Conventional methods of Cultivation on yield and biological efficiency of Paddy straw mushroom (<i>Volvariella volvaceae</i>).
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript contributes to the improvement of the paddy mushroom production method. It confirms scientific work previously carried out by other authors concerning the production of this mushroom species. So the work is important for scientific community. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Structure of manuscript is appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. I think the references are not sufficient in the introduction. In fact, I only count two references in the introduction. Many things are stated without justification in the introduction. I have mentioned this in the text. <p>I did not see the results relating to the conventional method, as the authors described this method in the text. See "materials and methods".</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The English level is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The topic covered by this article is very interesting. It contributes to food security, waste recycling and income generation for farmers. It contributes to food security, waste recycling, and income generation for farmers.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kpan Kpan Kouakou Gains
Department, University & Country	University of Nangui, Côte d'Ivoire