

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_124318
Title of the Manuscript:	Wild edible mushrooms of Rourkela Forest Division, Odisha, India
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: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Wild edible mushrooms are very important for the survival of the tribal local community in the area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Some Selected Wild edible mushrooms of Rourkela Forest Division, Odisha, India	
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.	Abstract should be little more elaborate with quantitative parameters of seasonal availability as well as price per kg with respect to the species.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Broadly fine but key words should be more specific suitable for the search engine for the readers.	
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.	Discussion and conclusion should be more elaborate. It would be better to have market survey data such as price per kg, amount availability per season (dry weight)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are fine. However can be added from the research papers published on the adjacent states.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please mention if there any traditional value addition technique for these species adopted by the local traders in the market As the species are already mentioned and available in the established research papers, some innovative works such as nutritive analysis could make the paper unique. Species wise taxonomic description as well as ecological importance would enhance the quality of the paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please mention if there any traditional value addition technique for these species adopted by the local traders in the market.	

Review Form 3

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:	Debabrata Saha
Department, University & Country	India