

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_131104
Title of the Manuscript:	One new species of Russula sect. Ingratae from India, based on morphology and molecular data
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This an interesting paper describing a new species of <i>Russula</i> in India. Even if I am not specialist of this genus I found the work important. It is a good contribution to the documentation of mushroom especially members of <i>Russula</i> in India and the world in general. Some minor corrections are needed (especially at the level of the conclusion) to upgrade the paper before publication. My comments are on the manuscript.	We addressed the comments raised by the reviewer through track change mode in the MS.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I propose: <i>Russula deodarae</i> sp. Nov., anew species of <i>Russula</i> sect. <i>Ingratae</i> from India, based on morphology and molecular data	Now we have changed the article title.
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.	It is comprehensive but it will be nice if authors could add in element of the ecology and local uses.	Now we have added the information of ecology and uses in the abstract section.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	I thing the structure and the content are acceptable for the presentation to scientific wold.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the many of the references are recent. However, the authors need to check the reference list very well because many cited in the text are not in the list of references.	Now, we have checked and missing references are added in the reference section.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is of good quality.	
Optional/General comments	The outcome of the study is interesting. However, it would had been better if for phylogenetic analyses genes of Indian species morphologically closes to this new one were also used. I assume that this is due to the lack of genes of those species in the GeneBank. I hope that in the future authors could perform phylogenetic study of <i>Russula</i> species of the area.	We have already added the Indian collections in the phylogenetic tree. Reviewer pointed that the species <i>R. obscuricolor</i> (from India) is missing in the tree, But this species is already present in our tree. I think there is no need to change the phylogeny.

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues.