Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAERI_113049**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative evaluation studies of different species of Pleurotus for Radial growth, Biomass and Yield parameters.**
Type of the Article	

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments 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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The subject of the manuscript can be important and significant from the perspective of agricultural science and family economics, but the mentioned version has not followed a proper research path and perhaps by examining more influential factors, it could have provided more useful results. 2. The title of the article needs to be revised. "Cultivation investigation and quantitative comparison of three Pleurotus mushroom species" **3.** The method and format of abstract preparation is not interesting. It seems that a thesis has been unprofessionally cut and presented in the form of a manuscript. 4. The structure of the manuscript needs revision. The investigated factors have no significant relationship with the reported results. 5. If he directs the reported results to the reviews of the manuscript, he may get his shape. 6. References are sufficient and new. It is suggested that the author of the manuscript read similar articles and then adjust his manuscript with a better perspective and more time.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The writing and quality of the English language presented in the manuscript is not fluent and is not interesting for the audience.	
Optional/General comments	A) By not examining 1- the quality of the mushrooms, 2- the medicinal effect, and only by checking the quantities (product weight factor), the results have been adjusted in the manuscript. B) Isn't it possible that a smaller amount of a mushroom species has a more acceptable medicinal effect than a more productive species? C) Isn't it possible that a mushroom with a lower quality has more practical quality and a more pleasant taste?	

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Arash Vaghef Koodehi**
Department, University & Country	**Kashan University, Institute of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, Iran**