

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_114791
Title of the Manuscript:	Turning Trash into Treasure: Utilizing Sericultural Wastes in Mushroom Cultivation
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents valuable insights into the utilization of sericultural wastes in mushroom cultivation, addressing important aspects such as environmental sustainability, waste reduction, and agricultural productivity. It offers significant contributions to the scientific community by highlighting the potential of repurposing agricultural waste for sustainable food production systems, particularly in regions with high sericulture activity.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable. I feel like it catches reader attention.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides overview of methods, results and conclusion. But yes, it may be benefited from additional clarity on methodology and result portion particularly regarding novelty and significance of the finding.</p> <p>4. Organization appears to be logical, clear subsections but somewhere in between introduction and while describing result lacks coherent and flow.</p> <p>5. I feel like its scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. References seems to be relevant and appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes the language is clear, concise and suitable for communication	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shreejana KC</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Montana State University, USA</b>