

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_83845
Title of the Manuscript:	NEOTROPICAL MICODIVERSITY OF MATO GROSSO/BRAZIL: ETHNOMICOLOGICAL ASPECTS AND SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
Type of the Article	Review Article

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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

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	<div>- Scientific nouns should be in italic form.</div> <div>- Most of keywords are reported in the title?</div> <div>- Manuscript too long (should be summarised).</div> <div>- 190 references very sufficient number.</div>	<div>We appreciate the reviewer considerations.</div> <div>1. Scientific names verified.</div> <div>2. Checked keywords</div> <div>3. Yes. The manuscript is a historical review, we think this review is important to show the aspects of theory of the region, the world readers.</div> <div>4. Due to be a historical review and encompassing indigenous ethnological conditions related to training and emergence of the capital of Mato Grosso, the references were cited, properly and due importance for the emphasis and complementarity of the manuscript.</div> <div>Answer to the questioning of the reviewer in the manuscript</div> <div>1. We remind you that the manuscript is a revision since the first publication found on fungi in the Region of Mato Grosso. No, we idealized a specific period for research, the authors concentrated on highlighting mycology in the region. In summary the period highlighted by 1979-2021, was inserted due to have been (1979) the first published work registration referring to fungi, and it was quoted in the general table of publications for the Region of the State of Mato Grosso / Brazil (end of the manuscript). It is observed that it is only a single work on this date being the same, a single referenced date (see table).</div> <div>2. The keywords were modified, and better structured, as suggestion of the reviewer.</div> <div>3. The questioning of the reviewer was not clear to the title on Paracoccidioides (page 31). We decided to modify the title.</div> <div>4. In relation to Figure 5 (page 39). We chose to remove from the manuscript. We are in accordance with the reviewer.</div>
Minor REVISION comments	<div>- English language should be checked (there is a mixture between English and british English)</div>	<div>Verified English words.</div>
Optional/General comments	<div>-Remove figure 5</div>	<div>We agree with the reviewer. We exclude Figure 5 of the manuscript.</div>

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)	