

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121266
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of different Agro-based waste extract media for Lentinula edodes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of high significance to the scientific community in the aspect of conversion of agricultural waste to national wealth. The successful execution of this study is expected to boost the economy and nutrition of the populace of the State of study and probably beyond. Involvement of tissue culture technique can be employed in further research for commercial production of shiitake mushroom spawn.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Not really. Suggested alternative title: <i>In vitro</i> cultivation of Shiitake mushrooms (<i>Lentinula edodes</i>) on the compost of some selected agro-based waste extracts.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. The abstract should be improved Additions: This study aimed at determining the <i>in vitro</i> performance of <i>L. edodes</i> using S1 to S17 combinations of agro-based waste extract media spawned on synthesized PDA incubated at 20°C and 24°C Recast: The Principal Component Analysis of recorded values of the mycelial growth was shown in the form of Eigen values, the highest of which was recorded in <i>L. edodes</i> grown on 7 DAI and 14 DAI at 24°C, indicating significant influence on substrates. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Not fully Suggested changes to sub-heading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of pure tissue culture of <i>Lentinula edodes</i> Preparation of the agro-based waste extract Presentation of experimental design for the study 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion should be more scientifically explicit. The authors did not discuss the critical findings of the research in details. The findings should be more supported by comparative discussions with recent and previous literatures to make this manuscript technically sound. In depth search of literatures on the study subject matters is suggested in order to achieve robust discussion of the findings. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No. References should be updated.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Constructions of grammar and punctuations need to be thoroughly checked. Inherent errors are suggested to be put right using Grammar checker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors studied "Evaluation of different Agro-based waste extract media for <i>Lentinula edodes</i>" which is appropriate for the research but for more scientific inclination, the title is modified to "<i>In vitro</i> cultivation of Shiitake mushrooms (<i>Lentinula edodes</i>) on the compost of some selected agro-based waste extracts".</p> <p>The literature review actually captured the research novelty and the aim and objective of the research. The method adopted for the research is appropriate for the results obtained but the results should be well articulated with the discussions. The discussion should, however, be explicit. The conclusion captured the future prospects of the research. The referencing was not consistent.</p> <p>Accept with serious major revision.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kester Christiana Titilayo</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bells University of Technology, Nigeria</p>