

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_126593
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Composition, Antimicrobial and Antioxidant Activities of Lactifluus vellereus
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 valuable as it explores <i>Lactifluus vellereus</i>, an under-researched mushroom, for its antioxidant and antimicrobial properties. It contributes important data on the mushroom's bioactive compounds, supporting the development of natural alternatives in combating microbial resistance. The study is well-organized, making a strong case for the therapeutic potential of mushrooms.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Chemical Composition, Antimicrobial and Antioxidant Activities of <i>Lactifluus vellereus</i>", is informative but could be refined for clarity and impact. Here's an alternative that may better emphasize the study's focus:</p> <p>"Bioactive Potential of <i>Lactifluus vellereus</i>: Insights into its Chemical Composition, Antimicrobial, and Antioxidant Properties"</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>	<p>The abstract is well-structured, providing a clear overview of the research purpose, methods, and main findings. In the last sentence, consider adding more specific implications of these findings to enhance the impact.</p> <p>Ensure that terms like "PFRAP" and "DPPH" are briefly explained or avoided in favor of simpler language.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and follow a logical scientific format. Each section (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion) is well-defined, making it easy to follow the study's progression.</p>	
<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>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust due to its clear methodology, including the use of reliable techniques. The data are well-supported by replicates and controls, enhancing reliability. Results are effectively contextualized within existing literature, affirming the validity and relevance of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Ensure that references reflect the latest studies, especially in areas like antioxidant mechanisms and antimicrobial research. Few references are very old.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise use of scientific terminology. It effectively conveys complex information, though minor improvements could enhance readability. Overall, it meets academic standards.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>The introduction offers a good foundation but could benefit from a more detailed explanation of why <i>Lactifluus vellereus</i> was chosen for this study compared to other mushrooms with similar bioactive properties.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>Details on Sample Collection: Mentioning the specific conditions (e.g., humidity, temperature) under which samples were stored might help in ensuring reproducibility.</p> <p>Methods: Consider specifying the concentration of solvents used for extraction and how the extracts' concentrations were standardized. Mention the equation used for calculation of FRAP, TAC etc.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Presentation of Data:</p> <p>The tables are informative but could benefit from formatting for clarity. For instance, a clearer distinction between test microorganisms in the antimicrobial activity section would improve readability.</p> <p>Figures: If possible, adding a figure to visually summarize key findings (e.g., antimicrobial activity zones) would make results more engaging.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Comparative Analysis: Consider expanding the comparison of <i>L. vellereus</i> to other mushrooms with similar properties, discussing unique aspects of its chemical profile or antimicrobial properties.</p> <p>Limitations and Future Directions: Briefly mentioning potential limitations (such as the variability in wild mushroom composition) and proposing specific future research directions could add depth.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practical Implications: Emphasize the practical applications of <i>L. vellereus</i> as a natural antioxidant or antimicrobial agent in food or pharmaceutical industries. 	

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajay Kumar
Department, University & Country	Sardar Patel College of Pharmacy, Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Technical University, India