

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_110877
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Activity of a Medicinal Mushroom, Ganoderma lucidum
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)	<p>The subject of this article is relevant and topical in the scientific world.</p> <p>The title of this article is suitable</p> <p>the abstract is comprehensive but does not respect the structure recommended by the authors guideline.</p> <p>The subsection and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate and are in accordance with the structure recommended by the authors' guideline.</p> <p>this article is scientifically well structured and correct</p> <p>most of the references cited are recent (less than 12 years old). thus the references cited are recent. this present article cites 37 references, which are quite representative</p>	<p>The editorial board is asked if there is a restrict rule for the abstract structure of the manuscript. Since we are replied as there is no restriction, the authors would prefer not to make any changes in the abstract structure to avoid problems such as repeated statements that affect the text fluency.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and quality of the writing are good and understandable and adapted scientifically</p>	<p>The authors would like to thank for the reviewer's valuable contribution to develop the manuscript.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>This study is of good scientific quality, and the subject matter is topical.</p> <p>It would also be interesting to present the results before discussing them with other studies.</p>	

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)	