

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_121882</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of tulsi leaf powder along with casing mixture on the growth parameters and yield of white button mushroom [Agaricus bisporus (Lange) Imbach]</b>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I believe it has valuable and innovative information. It is a study that will favor the cultivation of this species. It is a study that will provide an improvement option for the crop  SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	You must incorporate the objectives in the summary	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes, but it requires modifications to the results text. Authors should write a text that incorporates the information set out in the table and make reference to the statistical analysis. In discussion should make comparisons with other studies	
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.	This study has a scientific structure and experiment, but requires several scriptural modifications to be correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I believe that I should add some more references to the discussion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Duarte Evelyn Raquel
Department, University & Country	National University of Misiones, Argentina