

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_124132 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of neem leaf powder supplementation in casing mixture on the growth and yield parameters of white button mushroom [Agaricus bisporus (Lange) Imbach] |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory 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. | Mushroom is an edible vegetable which contains micronutrients and vitamins that have been proven to be effective against certain illnesses including cancer. Neem leaf powder supplementation which was used in this study contains biological compounds which is beneficial to the human system. As a result of this, it is important to research ways by which mushroom can be effectively cultivated with greater yield without the presence of mould. So therefore this research work is important to the scientific community due to the nutritional benefit of white button mushroom which can be fully harnessed in the absence of mould. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, it is suitable | |
| 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 of the article is comprehensive enough | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes, they are appropriate | |
| 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. | The manuscript is well written and the results were interpreted scientifically. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | I do not have suggestions of additional references but I would suggest more recent references of within five to ten years should be added to the manuscript, probably about five (5) more references should be added. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes , it is, though some errors observed are stated below. 'From present study' should be written as ' From this study'. ' it was concluded that the tested botanical it was found'' should also be re-written (on page 11). 'musdincloth' should be 'muslin cloth' (on page 3) | |
| Optional/General comments | I recommend the manuscript for publication | |

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: | Babatunde Peter Femi |
| Department, University & Country | Nigeria |