

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126301
Title of the Manuscript:	Eco-Habitat Assessment of One of the Most Expensive Edible Mushrooms (Tricholoma matsutake) in Genekha, Thimphu, Bhutan.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This manuscript effectively summarizes a thorough investigation into the habitat of <i>Tricholoma matsutake</i> in Genekha, Thimphu.2. It provides useful information on floristic composition and vegetation structure, considerably contributing to the understanding of this commercially important fungus.3. The impact could be increased by addressing clarity and adding further methodological detail.4. The findings have positive implications for habitat management and conservation efforts, making this an important study for scholars and practitioners in the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title matches the article's content. It clearly indicates that the study would focus on both the biological habitat and the specific mushroom species.</p> <p>The title has the following strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarity: It clearly distinguishes the study's subject (<i>Tricholoma matsutake</i>) and geographical focus (Genekha, Thimphu, and Bhutan).2. Relevance: The remark of "one of the most expensive edible mushrooms" emphasises the species' economic value, potentially attracting interest from both scientific and general audiences.	Accepted and kept as it is. No changes made.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The abstract covers habitat evaluation, species richness, vegetation structure, and ecological indices in detail. However, clarity and thoroughness might be enhanced. These changes and additions are suggested:• To improve readability, simplify difficult sentences when addressing clarity and structure. Shortening sentences makes information easier to understand.• Methodology: Briefly describe statistical methodologies utilised for data analysis. Describe how Menhinick's, Simpson's, and Shannon's indices were calculated to demonstrate the analysis's rigour. To improve the study's relevance, consider including a brief introduction describing the ecological and economic significance of <i>T. matsutake</i>. It establishes the importance of the assessment.• In the section on specific findings, briefly discuss the ecological roles or significance of key species associated with <i>T. matsutake</i> in the environment. It deepens the findings.• Explain the practical significance of the findings for habitat management and conservation. How might the results affect sustainable harvesting?• Clarity: Condense portions to highlight key results. The statement "having maximum IVI in the habitat" could be simplified or merged into species association.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Abstract is shortened and made more readable• Included brief methods on study sampling and statistical methodologies utilised for data analysis.• <i>Brief ecological assessment introduction is included in abstract “ It is ectomycorrhizal fungi with high ecological and economic value requiring an important ecological niche and tree associates”.</i>• Key findings were summarized
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript's solid methodology and data collecting show scientific robustness. To assure replicability and accuracy, the study used a quadrat approach to measure habitat factors and documented a large floristic composition with a clear statistical analysis. Multiple diversity indices (Menhinick's, Simpson's, and Shannon's) enhance ecological studies by revealing habitat species richness and distribution. Mycology and habitat protection benefit from the manuscript's technical soundness and incorporation of ecological interactions between <i>Tricholoma matsutake</i> and its accompanying flora.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference style is incorrect, and the references do not match. Make use of just one style.	References were corrected; Reference style used in APA Citation style

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The discussion section would greatly improve with a more thorough examination of the ecological implications of the findings. Identifying potential threats to <i>T. matsutake</i> habitats and proposing management strategies would significantly improve the manuscript's significance.Acknowledgements: If relevant, it may be beneficial to add an acknowledgement section to highlight the contributions of individuals or institutions that supported the research.Future Research Directions: A concise section outlining potential research opportunities arising from this study would be beneficial for steering future enquiries in the field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Potential threats and recommendations were added in discussion as well as conclusion part.Acknowledgement is submitted to highlight the contributions.Future, further studies to be conducted were also recommended and added in conclusion part of the manuscript

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)	