

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	InternationalJournalof Plant&SoilScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJPSS_110745
TitleoftheManuscript:	Exploringthe HiddenThreats:AComprehensiveStudyonIncidenceandInsectPestDiversityonButtonMushroom(Agaricusbisporus)inKashmir
Typeofthe Article	OriginalArticle

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correctthe manuscript and highlight that part in themanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
<p>CompulsoryREVISIONcomments</p> <p>1.Isthemanuscriptimportantfor scientificcommunity? (Pleasewritefewsentencesonthismanuscript)</p>	<p>Based on the information provided in the manuscript, it appears that the research is originaland has the potential to be impactful. The authors have identified a new pest complexaffecting button mushrooms in Kashmir Valley. This information could be valuable formushroom growers in the region, as it could help them to develop more effective pestmanagement strategies. However, the manuscript does have some limitations. The authorsdid not provide any data on the economic impact of the pests. Additionally, the study wasconducted in a single location, so it is unclear whether the results are generalizable to otherregions. Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the scientific literature onmushroompests.</p>	
<p>2.Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (If notpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)</p>	<p>The title Exploring the Hidden Threats: A Comprehensive Study on Incidence andInsect Pest Diversity on Button Mushroom (Agaricus bisporus) in Kashmir is a goodtitle for the article. It is informative and attention-grabbing, and it accurately reflects thecontentofthe article. Herearesomeotherpossibletitles that you could consider:</p> <p>OccurrenceandDiversityofInsectPestsAssociatedwithButtonMushroomCultivation inKashmir</p> <p>ASurveyofInsectPestsAffectingButtonMushroomProductioninKashmir</p> <p>ManagingtheThreat:ASTudyofInsectPests andTheirImpactonButtonMushroomProductioninKashmir</p>	

[ReviewForm 1.7](#)

<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the article, but it could be more comprehensive in a few areas:</p> <p>1. Impact of pests: The abstract mentions that various insect pests were found, but it does not explicitly state the impact of these pests on button mushroom cultivation. This could be improved by adding a sentence or two about the potential damage caused by these pests, such as reduced yield, crop loss, or economic impact.</p> <p>2. Specific locations: While the abstract mentions different locations within the Kashmir Valley, it does not provide specific details about them. Adding the number of samples collected or the specific regions within each location studied would provide a more comprehensive picture of the study's scope.</p> <p>3. Quantifying pest incidence: The abstract mentions that the pest incidence was highest in July and August, but it does not provide any specific data on the actual percentage of infestation. Including a brief mention of the peak incidence values would be helpful for readers to understand the severity of the problem.</p> <p>4. Keywords: The keywords are relevant to the study, but they could be expanded to include more specific terms related to the identified pest species and their impact on button mushrooms.</p>	
<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Overall, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized.</p> <p>Areas for improvement:</p> <p>Introduction: While the introduction provides a good overview of the topic, it could be further strengthened by including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A more specific mention of the research objectives. ○ A brief overview of the existing literature on the topic. ○ A clear statement of the research gap and the significance of the study. <p>Methodology: The methodology is well-written, but it could be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing more details about the methods used to collect and identify pests. ○ Including information about the sample size and statistical analysis methods. <p>Results: The results are clearly presented, but it would be helpful to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group the data by pest type instead of location for easier comparison. ○ Highlight key findings and trends. <p>Discussion: The discussion section is well-written, but it could be strengthened by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elaborating more on the implications of the findings. ○ Discussing the limitations of the study. ○ Suggesting future research directions. 	
<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>Based on the information you provided, it is difficult to definitively say whether the manuscript is scientifically correct. While the structure and organization of the manuscript appear appropriate, there are some areas that require further review to assess its scientific accuracy.</p>	

ReviewForm 1.7

	<p>Here are some specific aspects that need closer examination:</p> <p>1. Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific methods: The manuscript should clearly describe the methods used for collecting and identifying pests. This includes details such as sampling techniques, sample size, and identification procedures. • Statistical analysis: The manuscript should explicitly state the statistical methods used to analyze the data and report the results accordingly. This includes information about the software used, statistical tests performed, and p-values. <p>2. Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data presentation: The data should be presented in a clear and concise manner, using appropriate tables and figures with clear captions and legends. • Data interpretation: The authors should carefully interpret the data and avoid making unsupported claims or generalizations. <p>3. Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review: The discussion should critically review relevant scientific literature and compare the findings of the study with existing knowledge. • Limitations: The authors should acknowledge the limitations of their study, such as methodological limitations or potential biases. • Future research: The discussion should suggest directions for future research based on the findings of the study. 	
<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Overall, the references provided seem sufficient to support the manuscript's claims and findings. They cover a diverse range of sources, including relevant scientific journals, books, and technical bulletins. The majority of the references are relatively recent, with most published within the last 10-15 years. This suggests that the manuscript draws upon current knowledge and research in the field.</p> <p>Here are some specific examples of additional references you could consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On sciarid fly control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Management of mushroom sciarid flies (<i>Lycoriella ingenua</i> Duda): a review of current and potential methods" by I.K. Tomberlin and C.R. Winks (2019) ○ "Evaluation of novel insecticides for the control of adult sciarid flies (Diptera: Sciaridae) in commercial mushroom farms" by S.M. Kanga et al. (2021) • On mite control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Biological control of mites on mushrooms" by J.E. Gillespie and S.C. Neven (2006) ○ "Evaluation of essential oils for the control of <i>Tyrophagus putrescentiae</i> in stored rice" by A.A. Al-Mahrouq et al. (2020) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>the language quality is strong and suitable for scholarly communication. With some minor revisions and improvements, the manuscript can achieve an even higher level of clarity and professionalism. 1. Consider using the active voice more frequently for a more engaging writing style. 2. Terminology consistency: Ensure consistent use of technical terms throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[ReviewForm 1.7](#)

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:	Sanyogita Shahi
Department, University & Country	Kalinga University, India