Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAHR_115444**
Title of the Manuscript:	**OPTIMIZATION OF GROWTH AND PRODUCTION OF BROWN OYSTER MUSHROOMS (Pleurotus cystidiosus) THROUGH ADDITIONAL NUTRIENTS OF RICE WASHING WATER AND RICE GROATS**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**REVIEW comments required** **1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community?** **(Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)** **R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO THE WORLDWIDE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. IT WAS TYPETED VERY CAREFULLY AND ABOVE ALL USING THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES.** **2. Is the article title appropriate?** **(If not, please suggest an alternative title)** **R/ THE TITLE IS APPROPRIATE AND MEETS THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH.** **3. Is the article summary comprehensive?** **R/ ABSTRACT IS WELL ORGANIZED AND RESPONDS TO THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. THERE IS ONLY LEFT TO INTRODUCE THE CONCLUSIONS.** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS WELL STRUCTURED AND ONLY PRESENTS A FEW ERRORS, EASY TO CORRECTION.** **THE SCIENTIFIC NAMES OF THE SPECIES UNDER STUDY MUST BE CORRECT, ACCORDING TO THE CODES ESTABLISHED FOR EACH SPECIES.** **.** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention in the review form.** **R/ IN THE REFERENCES IS WHERE THE BIGGEST ERRORS APPEAR IN THE MANUSCRIPT. 26 REFERENCES WERE REPORTED IN THE TEXT CORRECTLY, ACCORDING TO THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES, BUT IN THE FINAL LIST REFERENCE 26 DOES NOT APPEAR TYPETED.** **OTHER ERRORS OCCUR IN THE WRITING OF THE LIST REFERENCES, IN WHICH THERE ARE TYPING ERRORS. 2 REFERENCED IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO CORRECT BECAUSE THE REFERENCES WERE NOT LOCATED ON THE INTERNET. 2 REFERENCES WERE MISREFERENCED AND SHOULD BE CORRECTED.** **(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)** **R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT WAS TYPED VERY WELL, EXCEPT FOR THE ERRORS LOCATED AND INFORMED. I THINK THE AUTHORS COULD CORRECT THESE ERRORS AND ACHIEVE A MANUSCRIPT THAT CAN BE PUBLISHED.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Minor REVIEW comments 1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for academic communications? R/ REGARDING THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE USED IN WRITING THE MANUSCRIPT, I CONSIDER IT TO BE SUITABLE AND WITHOUT DIFFICULTIES FOR GOOD ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez**
Department, University & Country	**Havana University, Cuba**