



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43814
Title of the Manuscript:	Abilities of Tectona grandis and Celtis zenkeri (hardwood) sawdust as substrates of Pleurotus species and their indigenous fungi
Type of the Article	Original research papers

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Title not comprehensive, because the article cites characteristics of nutritional composition, which are greatly explored in the results and discussion, review the title. - abstract not presented on nutritional composition - methodology of isolation and identification of resident fungi needs to be better detailed, explained - tables and text without units of measurements in some parts - line 51 - ... methodology adapted / modified based on Gbolagade (2006) ... - Calculation of biological efficiency as performed? - conclusion = resident fungi cited in the text can produce toxins and deteriorate the basidiomas, so review the discussion and conclusion about them. 	<p>The TITLE is broad and all encompassing. The suggestion of the reviewer is already implied in the title. Such experiment as given by the title is incomplete without experiment on nutritional composition.</p> <p>ABSTRACT-: Correction effected. Results on nutritional composition has been included in the abstract as pointed out. However characteristics of nutritional composition explored in the work was a means to an end and not an end in itself. As such it may not necessarily reflect in the abstract.</p> <p>Methodology of isolation & identification of resident fungi-: Correction effected.</p> <p>Tables & Text without Units-: Correction effected.</p> <p>Line 51-: The actual method of Gbolagade (2006) was used and not modified/adapted.</p> <p>Biological efficiency-: Unit now included.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusion on resident fungi-: Corrections effected to accommodate contaminating toxins.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		