



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Data shown in the tables are much confusing.</p> <p>TABLE.1: The data in table 1 do not specify the following-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Data shown for mushroom species i.e. <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> and <i>P. Sajor-caju</i> do not specify the substrate type. (b) Likewise, the data shown for the substrate type i.e. <i>Celtic zenkeri</i> and <i>Tectona grandis</i> do not specify the <i>Pleurotus</i> sp. (c) The term fermented and unfermented do not specify the substrate type. (d) The data shown for saw dust condition (fermented and unfermented) also do not specify whether it belong to <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> or <i>P. sajor caju</i>. <p>Table.2: The data in table 2 do not specify the following-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The unit is not specified for wheat bran concentration. (b) All the data viz., cap length, cap diameter, cap width etc. do not specify whether these may belong to <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> or <i>P. sajor-caju</i>. (c) The data also do not indicate that on which substrate (fresh/ fermented sawdust of <i>Celtic zenkeri</i> or <i>Tectona grandis</i>) the wheat bran supplementation has been done. <p>Table.4: The table 4 has same ambiguity.</p>	<p>a) Table 1-: In the first 2 lines (i.e. mushroom species), the larger picture was to compare the overall growth of the two mushroom species on the substrate, irrespective of substrate type. As such the GLM Procedure of SAS was given the command, and it POOLED the data to execute the command.</p> <p>b) The same explanation holds for substrate type (i.e. <i>Celtic zenkeri</i> and <i>Tectona grandis</i>), the bigger picture here was to compare the overall abilities of the two sawdust types in supporting growth of the two mushrooms using a POOLED data.</p> <p>c) The same explanation goes for fermented and unfermented where the focus was to compare the effect of fermentation and non fermentation on the substrate's ability to support growth, irrespective of the type of substrate.</p> <p>d) The same explanation holds here as well where the GLM Procedure of SAS engaged a POOLED data.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>a) Correction effected</p> <p>b & c) As the title reflects, the values are results after analysis of POOLED data for both <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> and <i>Pleurotus sajor-caju</i>, as well as fermented and unfermented. Here the focus was the CONCENTRATION of the additive (wheat bran) and not the mushroom species nor fermentation or non-fermentation. This means the data for both mushrooms as well as fermented and unfermented were POOLED in order to examine the overall impact of each concentration on growth parameters. The results therefore compared the three concentrations in their overall impacts on growth of the mushrooms irrespective of species and irrespective of fermentation or non-fermentation.</p> <p>Table 4: The same explanation above also holds here.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The information given in the table is ambiguous and needs further attention.	