Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJAHR_87682**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Mushroom cultivation for Increasing income and sustainable development of small and marginal farmers**
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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy)

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	The article deals with a topic that is not new, but is always a issue of great concern in developing countries, livelihoods for people from agricultural activities. However: - Title needs to be added "in India". **-** The abstract are lacking the summary of method, and main findings from the review. All information is presented as only the importance of mushroom growth for livelihoods. - Which dimensions and criteria to assess/review the sustainable development for the domestic farmers (focusing on income and livelihood issues)? The title of the article allows to understand that the beneficiaries are focused on the farmer households. However, how should the definitions of "small and marginal farmers" in India be understood? What aspects and criteria should be assessed for income increase and sustainable development from mushroom cultivation with the 2 above objects? What is the rate of increase in income? What is the rate of increase in income?, etc. The study has not clearly answered these focuses. The study mainly provides fragmentary examples of production status. Table 1: Temperature requirements of some important mushrooms seem to have nothing to do with the objective of the paper. Fig 1 is a variety of photographs of fungi that are more suited to the classification of plants (mushrooms), rather than demonstrating its role in people's livelihoods. Why the parts: "MATERIAL METHODS" and "PROGRESS MADE" are arranged as ones of the last contents of a review article? Besides, the reference source is very poor to support for the paper In general, the information in the article is interpreted in a rambling, poor, unfocused, and unconvinced way whether in the type of a review or a case-study. Those are the main reasons why I don't go into detail on wording matters.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)***	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tuyet-Anh T. Le**
Department, University & Country	**Environment, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada**