

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_128402
Title of the Manuscript:	Diversity and distribution of Termitomyces spp. in the ecological niches of Central and Northern Kerala, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript entitled "Diversity and distribution of Termitomyces spp. in the ecological niches of Central and Northern Kerala, India" is well presented by the authors, which is a type of survey. The authors had attempted to explore the species of mushroom as natural environment indicators of Kerala state which could be a informative source for the researchers in the area of environment science, climate change and soil science.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine however, it would be appreciated if the authors would have mentioned the names of three districts in place of central and northern Kerala.	
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 is comprehensive; however, it would be better if the authors could able to mention the few lines on its production, consumption.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is more aligned towards survey, it would have been better if the authors could have mentioned its benefits towards mankind.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors are recommended to add recent references of high impact journals.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It can be managed.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors are highly recommended to clarify the designated codes mentioned in the table1, for example, T1 reflects what? The conclusion may be reframed. Explain the numbers of AEU in footnote of the table1.	

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santosh Kumar Behera
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER), Ahmedabad, India