

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127647
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of different substrates for growth and yield parameters of pink oyster mushroom (<i>Pleurotus djamor</i>)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is a contribution to fungal ecology and waste management. The study is eco-friendly and can be repeated by anyone because no special equipment and expertise are required. The raw materials are abundant, cheap and available.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract is not comprehensive; it lacks some key elements of an abstract. The results was poorly stated without the following: a. The author did not state how the data used to get the results were gotten, e.g. the equipments/tools used to obtain data, how many times it was repeatedly collected. b. Did not mention how the statistical analysis was carried out (the statistical software used in the study, what was tested and at what level of probability) c. The abstract also lacks conclusion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No, the manuscript lacks a very key element of scientific work; the result was presented without mentioning how it was carried out (the data analysis software used) these should be written under materials and methods.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The study has few reference and some are outdated.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It was stated in Materials and Methods in page 3 that the study was carried out during October 2023 to November 2023. I kindly advice that this should be revisited. Please explain in details how biological efficiency and benefit cost ratio was gotten for repeatability.	

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:	Okafor Maryrose Chikaosolu
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeri