SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_52395
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of mycelial growth of different Tricholoma matsutake strains in soil medium at varying temperatures
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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

	Paviewar's comment	Author's commont (if agro
	Reviewer's comment	highlight that part in the mar his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	 Proposed article is scientifically significant and technically sound. But, data presented is not sufficient enough to recommend for publication. Comments: Purpose and potential of selecting experimental organisms needs to be mentioned in introduction section. Last sentence of introduction is concluding remarks and is better to place in conclusion section. Isolation technique required in materials and methods section. How much soil and MYPG nutrient medium were used for inoculation in incubation vials. Cultivation of mycelia section needs to be divided into two subsections viz. isolation technique required in terms of mycelia – and details should be mentioned. It seems that growth was measured in terms of mycelia mass on 89th days of inoculation and incubation. In my opinion, linear growth measurement is performed on different days of inoculation for each strain. Or I am unable to understand. Statistical analysis is required to establish the growth relation among various strains. Figure 1 & 2 shows that there is significant variation in data obtained for five replica for particular strain at particular temperature. e.g. one replica (out of five) of Rin 10 and 1122 incubated at 5⁴C showed no growth. It is not justified. Also, there is large variation for growth speed obtained for particular temperature for growth and densities observation. Needs to be corrected or clarified. Conclusion - The optimum temperature for linear mycelia growth and mecelial density increasemay be written as The optimum temperature for increased linear mycelia growth and mecelial density 	
Ontional/Concret comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed we that part in the manuscript. It is feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kaushal Kishore Choudhary
Department, University & Country	Ram Jaipal College, Chapra, Jai Prakash University, India

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her