

Original Research Article

Diversity of Basidiomycetous Macrofungi from Mpanga forest in Mpigi district, central Uganda

Comment [AM1]: Upper case

Comment [AM2]: Upper case

Comment [AM3]: Upper case

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted at Mpanga Research Forest located in Mpigi District, Uganda, during the months of March, April, May and Jun 2020 (for the first rainy season) then in September, October, November, and December 2020 (for the second rainy season) to determine the diversity and distribution of macrofungi as well as their influence by seasonality, and physicochemical properties of the soil. An inventory was carried out through plot sampling and survey which consists of installing three permanent plots of 30 m x 30 m in each of the four selected sites, the soil was also measured in the sample plots. To measure distribution and diversity, abundance, species richness, density, and Simpson's and Shannon's indices were calculated. SPSS software was used for the significance tests of the diversity parameters between the two rainy seasons and for those of the correlation between the soil factors and the abundance of macrofungi species. A total of 120 species of basidiomycetous macrofungi distributed in 53 genera and 22 families were recorded. The dominant genus was *Psathyrella* followed by *Marasmius* belonging to the most dominant families (Coprinaceae and Marasmiaceae), and the most dominant orders (Agaricales and Tricholomatales). During the two rainy seasons, the majority of the species that have been collected belong to the group of saprophytes. Macrofungi species collected during the second rainy season were more abundant and diverse than those collected during the first rainy season. Among the physicochemical properties of the soil, pH, calcium, potassium, nitrogen, organic carbon, phosphorus, clay, sand and organic matter were significantly correlated with the abundance of macrofungal species. The results of this study provided basic information on the diversity of macrofungi in Mpanga forest, it can be a point of reference for further research to study the evolution of macrofungal biodiversity in this forest.

Comment [AM4]: Which version?

Key words: Macrofungi, Basidiomycete, Diversity, Distribution, rainy season, soil factors, Mpanga forest.

Comment [AM5]: Use 1 line spacing not 1.5

Comment [AM6]: Key words should be between 3- 5 words.

INTRODUCTION

Fungi are one of the four classifications of the living kingdom, alongside animals, plants, and bacteria. Formerly classified as plants, they now form a separate kingdom within the eukaryotic group, called Mycota or Fungi [1]. The reign of Mycota is not limited to large mushrooms whose appearance in the forest and sales in the markets are familiar to us; it also includes molds that attack our food, parasitize our skin or give the cheese a special taste. These molds are called microfungi because they are invisible to the naked eye. The term macrofungi (mushrooms) or macromycetes has been defined by several authors who all agree on the production of fruiting bodies visible to the naked eye [2, 3, 4, 5]. Most macrofungi are members of Basidiomycota, but some belong to Ascomycota. These two divisions are distinguished by their sexual reproduction spores which are internal, contained in asci for Ascomycota and external, carried by sterigmata at the top of the basidia for Basidiomycota. Macrofungi, in particular basidiomycetous, which appear mainly during the rainy season in forests, are less known than higher plants because of their ephemeral appearance. Despite their short lifespan, basidiomycetous macrofungi play an important role for the local communities of tropical Africa as sources of food, medicines and substantial income [6,7,8]. Over two-thirds of these communities depend on forest products, either for subsistence or as cash income derived from a wide range of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), including basidiomycetous macrofungi [9].

Apart from the nutritional and medicinal aspects, basidiomycetous macrofungi play also an important role in ecosystem functioning [10] by allowing nutrient recycling, growth, and seedling establishment in forest soil [11]. Thus, they are very good indicators of the health or age of an ecosystem [12]. In Africa, the work of [13], [14], and [15] conducted in West Africa have shown the fundamental role played by basidiomycetous macrofungi in the functioning and regeneration of natural forest ecosystems in tropical Africa. In addition to their ecological importance, basidiomycetous macrofungi constitute an important heritage among the world's biological resources, on the one hand through their usefulness and on the other hand through their diversity [16,17,18,19,20].

The fungal kingdom is currently one of the most diverse systematic groups in the biosphere after insects [21], the number of species is estimated at 2.2 to 3.8 million worldwide [22], but macrofungi are less represented with an estimate of 140,00 species [23]. Within the group of macrofungi, the basidiomycetous are the most diversified and studied with 22,000 species described worldwide [24]. However, despite being an important heritage among the world's biological resources, the documentation on their diversity is still insufficient in sub-Saharan

Africa. This insufficiency is more marked in West Africa because no flora has yet been available and the recent studies were carried out by [25,26], [10], [27], [28] and [29]. In South Africa, [30] recently published the first macrofungi checklist for South Africa. The most in-depth work has been carried out in Central and East Africa with the existence of three flora: “the iconographic flora of the mushrooms of Congo” [31], “the illustrated flora of the mushrooms of Central Africa” [32], and “a preliminary agaric flora of East Africa” [33] but the recent studies were carried out by [34, 35, 36]. In East Africa, diversity has been widely documented in older publications but recent ones have been done by [37], [38] and [39]. In Uganda, apart from the very old publications of [33], [40], [41], studies conducted by [42] and [43] summarize the literature on the diversity of basidiomycetous macrofungi. The studies conducted by [42] and [43] recorded respectively 10 species of basidiomycetous macrofungi belonging to 5 genera and 173 species of basidiomycetous macrofungi belonging to 62 genera. However, the study conducted by [43] focused exclusively on one subclass of basidiomycetes called Aphyllophoromycetidae.

The equatorial natural forest of Mpanga with its 500 species of trees and shrubs, 300 species of birds, 97 butterflies, and 112 moths [44], has been the subject of many studies on animal and plant biodiversity [45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50]. It has also been the subject of a study on the Saprophytic Ascomycetous and Fungi Imperfecti on dead and decomposing branches, logs, and stumps [51], but no studies focusing exclusively on Basidiomycetous macrofungi have ever been carried out, hence the need to study them because of their risk of extinction due to anthropogenic activities to which the forest is exposed. Despite the Ugandan government's commitment to promoting the conservation, management, and sustainable use of its biological resources by 2025 [52], the lack of data on the diversity of such an important resource in Uganda, which is the wettest country in the sub-region with its 4.9 million hectares of natural forests [53] conducive for the development of macrofungi, constitutes a failure in the sustainable management of this forest resource. That's why this present study aims mainly to contribute to the knowledge of the diversity of Basidiomycetous macrofungi in Mpanga forest for good sustainable management, knowing that the protection of biodiversity has become a major issue of forest policy. Specifically, it consists in determining the diversity and distribution of macrofungi as well as their influence by seasonality and physicochemical properties of the soil.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

The study was conducted at Mpanga Research Forest located in Mpigi District, Uganda (**Figure 1**). Mpanga Forest Reserve (0 ° 127 'N, 32 ° 175' E) is an area of moist semi-deciduous tropical forest with *Celtis* that lies between 1140 and 1200 m altitude in Mawokota County, south of Mengo, 3 km southwest of Mpigi town, 36 km west of Kampala and 25 km north-west Entebbe, only about 20 km from the shores of Lake Victoria [48]. It is also located in the climatic zone of Lake Victoria [54], characterized by a bimodal distribution of precipitation, with the wettest periods from March to June and from September to December as shown by the ombrothermic diagram of Mpigi district (**Figure 2**). The mean annual precipitation and the minimum and maximum temperatures are estimated at 1168 mm, 17.2 ° C, and 26.1 ° C, respectively with a relative humidity of 90% according to [49]. Soils in the region are generally red and yellow latosols on the peaks and crests, sandy-gray loams on the lower slopes of the hills, and gray-blue clays and silts on the lower slopes and valleys [55 and 56]. Mpanga is a small expanse of natural equatorial forest of 453 hectares [57] which supports an impressive plant biodiversity composed of 500 species of trees and shrubs [58], dominated by Cannabaceae followed by Moraceae and Euphorbiaceae [59]. Some of the floristic elements are *Beilschmiedia ugandensis*, *Euphorbia hirta*, *Euphorbia heterophylla*, *Lovoa trichillioides*, *Budongo Mahogany*, *Euntumia Africana*, *Morus nigra*, *Trichilla emetica*, *Celtis mildbraedii*, *Pseudospondias macrocarpa*, *Celtis durandii*, *Albizia coliria*, *Albizia glaberrima*, *Albizia zygia*, *Celtis zenkeri*, *Antiaris toxicaria*, *Entandrophragma spp.*, *Funtumia spp.*, *Antiaris toxicaria*, *Ficus exasperata*, *Ficus mucoso*.

Comment [AM7]: Delete

Comment [AM8]: Remove the italic

Comment [AM9]: Ditto




Figure 1. Study area (Mpanga forest) in Mpigi district, Uganda




Figure 2. Ombrothermic diagram of Mpigi district (2020)

Survey

Surveys were carried out in the forest of Mpanga, during the months of March, April, May and Jun 2020 (for the first rainy season) then of September, October, November and December 2020 (for the second rainy season) since macrofungi can't be observed all year round [60] for most of the time. Macrofungi are not distributed at random; several factors condition their growth. They exhibit pattern of diversity that are related to largely to substratum and host availability [61]. This host, which is related to vegetation, is obviously of capital importance for the success of the macrofungi harvesting campaign because many ectomycorrhizal species (for example in the genera *Cantharellus*, *Lactarius*, *Russula*, and most Boletales) are associated with certain forest species [62]. Apart from vegetation, ecological factors such as precipitation and physicochemical properties of the soil are also to be considered. Thus, a preliminary study was carried out at the beginning of February 2020 to confirm the choice of sites which should house the plots. This study was guided by an experienced forest agent who has a good knowledge of the different types of forest vegetation in Mpanga. At the end of this preliminary study, 4 sites were selected:

Sites 1 and 3: are the clear part of the forest rich in Cannabaceae, dominated by the *Celtis* (**a** and **c**).

Sites 2 and 4: characterized by a vegetation rich in Euphorbiaceae and Moraceae (**b** and **d**).



Photo 1. The vegetation of the 4 prospected sites: **(a and c)**- Vegetation rich in Cannabaceae, dominated by *Celtis*; **(b and d)**- Vegetation rich in Euphorbiaceae and Moraceae

Sampling

The survey method that was used is plot and survey sampling recommended by [63]. Three permanent plots of 30m x 30m have been installed in each of the 4 sites (**Figure 3**). The location of the plots was chosen at random within the sites. The distance between the plots (taken two by two) of the same site is at least 100 m. In order to facilitate the location of the plots, trees along the boundaries of the plots have been tied with a ribbon and the geographic coordinates of the plots and of each species of macrofungi harvested have been recorded using a GPS. The geographical coordinates of the plots are as follows:

Site 1 / Plot1 ($0^{\circ} 12' 33''$ N - $32^{\circ} 18' 9''$ E); **Plot2** ($0^{\circ} 12' 33''$ N - $32^{\circ} 18' 12''$ E); **Plot3** ($0^{\circ} 12' 29''$ N - $32^{\circ} 18' 6''$ E).

Site 2 / Plot4 ($0^{\circ} 12' 42''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 27''$ E); **Plot5** ($0^{\circ} 12' 36''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 27''$ E); **Plot6** ($0^{\circ} 12' 39''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 31''$ E).

Site 3 / Plot7 ($0^{\circ} 12' 14''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 7''$ E); **Plot8** ($0^{\circ} 12' 9''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 11''$ E); **Plot9** ($0^{\circ} 12' 15''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 13''$ E).

Site4 / Plot10 ($0^{\circ} 12' 11''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 42''$ E); **Plot11** ($0^{\circ} 12' 9''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 4''$ E); **Plot12** ($0^{\circ} 12' 6''$ N - $32^{\circ} 17' 46''$ E).

To measure the soil, 1-kilogram soil samples were taken at a depth of 0 to 15 cm + the humus layer in each of the four sites in duplicate. The samples were air-dried at about 25 °C for 5 days to eliminate the moisture. They were then ground using a porcelain pestle and mortar and then sieved through a 2-millimeter sieve to remove debris and other non-soil materials including stones and roots. The sieved soil samples were repackaged, clearly labeled to be analyzed from the Soil, Plant, and Water analytical Laboratory at the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences of Makerere University. On the sieved soils samples, a broad spectrum of agronomy related soil properties was analyzed and these included; soil pH, soil organic matter and carbon, total nitrogen, available phosphorus; exchangeable Calcium (Ca^{2+}), Magnesium (Mg^{2+}), Sodium (Na^+), Potassium (K^+), and soil texture (the percentage proportions of sand, clay, and silt).

Comment [AM10]: °C

Comment [AM11]: Make it superscript

Comment [AM12]: ditto

Comment [AM13]: upper case

Comment [AM14]: ditto

Comment [AM15]: ditto




Figure 3. Location of sites in Mpanga Forest

Comment [AM16]: delete

Comment [AM17]: add

Data collection

Each week, a site was visited, and always on the same day of the week. Since we have 4 sites in which 3 plots were placed, every month, all the plots were visited during the first rainy season and second rainy season of the year 2020. Thus, in one month, 4 surveys (periods) were carried out in all the sites, which corresponds to 16 surveys for the first rainy season and 16 surveys for the second rainy season. A total of 32 surveys were taken throughout the harvesting season. The survey technique consists of sweeping the entire plot in 2m parallel strips to avoid omissions [64]. During the survey, all visible macrofungi were systematically collected and sorted by species, the number of individuals of each species was also counted.

This technique was supplemented by opportunistic sampling to consider the random distribution of fruiting bodies and species observed outside the plots [64].

For in situ photography of collected samples, a digital camera was used to photograph each taxon encountered in order to materialize the morphological characters. The following parameters were taken into account and noted for each sample collected: the type of substrate on which the macrofungi grows (on bare soil, on litter, on a living or senescent tree trunk or other); the degree of cover (a wooded area or not) and the humidity of the environment (very humid, humid, dry or very dry soil). The characteristics of each species of macrofungi harvested are noted, including the size and color of each part, the presence or absence of a ring, the shape of the ring, and the presence of pores or blades [28]. The collected samples are put in a basket and transported to the Laboratory of the Faculty of Agriculture of Uganda Martyrs University.

Identification

The identification of the samples collected was based on the description of the morphological, organoleptic and ecological characteristics of the specimens. The description of the macromorphological characteristics requires a rigorous and detailed visual examination of the macrofungus in all its contours. The description of our samples was carried out based on the recommendations of [65] concerning the agricooid (lamellate) and boletoid species and of [66] for the description of the porous and rough structure species (polypores). These recommendations consist in describing the different parts of the sporophore (**cap**, **hymenophore**, and **foot** or **stipe**) as well as the **flesh** of each sample.

The description of the **cap** focused on the main identification characteristics such as the shape, the coating, the margin, color, and diameter. That of the **hymenophore** focused on its color, shape, and insertion as well as the organization of its lamellae. Concerning the **foot** or **stipe**, the description also covered the color, shape, length, insertion, and ornamentation. The general veil and the partial veil or ring are also described if they exist. Consistency, color, smell and flavor are the characteristics that have been described for the **flesh**.

The organoleptic characteristics that have been described are smell and taste. These are important characters but very difficult to categorize. Nevertheless, certain smells like bleach, radish, corpse, lighting gas, old camembert, etc. [67] can be distinguished. The smell can sometimes be surprising: garlic, citrus, almond, anise, cinnamon, chlorine, maple, flour, fetid, etc. [68, 69, 62].

The parameters which have been taken into account to describe the ecological characteristics are the texture of the soil, the type of substrate on which the macrofungus grows (on bare

soil, on litter, on the trunk of a living or senescent tree or other); the degree of cover (a wooded area or not) and the humidity of the environment (very wet, wet, dry or very dry soil).

Other characteristics like latex and spore color are also described. Some basidiomycetous macrofungi such as species belonging to the genus *Lactarius*, present milk after their cutting or crumpling. The color, the taste, the viscosity and abundance of this milk are important characteristics for determining a species [68, 62]. To reveal the color of the spores, the classic technique (**Fig.4**) inspired by [62] was performed. It consists in cutting the foot of the fresh specimen and placing the cap, hymenium downwards, on a white paper. Then cover the hat with glass to prevent it from drying out and maintain a humid confined atmosphere. A few hours are needed to that the hymenium releases enough spores and that their color can be judged by mass. Spore color is one of the most important characters for species identification [68, 62].

Comment [AM18]: delete




Fig 4. Classic method of obtaining a spore [62]

Comment [AM19]: delete

Comment [AM20]: insert

The identification of a macrofungus based on the description of the morphological characteristics is a tedious task that systematically appeals to all the senses and requires a very observant mind, but essential to obtain a reference specimen of scientific value [62, 28]. The study of these characteristics, part of which was carried out in the field, was completed in the laboratory of the Faculty of Agriculture of Uganda Martyrs University.

By comparing the morphological and ecological characteristics previously described with those described in the identification manuals, the confirmation of the identification of our samples was carried out. The manuals which were used to confirm the identification are: "Iconographic flora of the mushrooms of the Congo" [70], "Illustrated flora of the mushrooms of Central Africa [71], Taxonomic and identification of edible mushrooms dense

forests from central Africa [62], and " A preliminary Agaric Flora of East Africa" [33]. The last one is a review of the macrofungi of tropical Africa with a focus on East Africa. For the update and the nomenclature of macrofungi, the exhaustive synonym update list available at <http://www.indexfungorum.org/names/Names.asp> was consulted.

Classification

The systematic classification of macrofungi is based and established on morphological characteristics. To classify a macrofungus, it must first be identified. This identification was based on the observation of morphological, organoleptic, and ecological characteristics. The systematic classification method that was used is largely inspired by that of [72], [65], and [67]. The use of keys determination of [73] concerning the characteristics observed, allowed, by a succession of choices and proposals, to move forward in the determination. However, all characteristics allowing the identification of macrofungi are not taken into consideration to classify them [74].

Preservation

The most practical and common method of preservation in mycology consists of simply drying the specimens [62]. Thus, our samples were dried using a drying oven at a temperature of 50 to 65 ° C in order to preserve the DNA and allow its subsequent analysis. The drying time was 2 hours for non-fleshy specimens and 4 hours for fleshy or waterlogged specimens. After drying and in order to avoid any rehydration, the still hot specimens were packaged with their number in hermetic plastic bags of the "Minigrip" type which were immediately sealed. Before final conservation in the herbarium, labelling was carried out. On the label, the name of the collector and the unique number associated with the specimen, the date, and place of harvest, the geographical coordinates, the altitude as well as any vegetation and ecological data [62] have been included.

Data analysis

Diversity analysis

The different orders and families of macrofungi were plotted against the total number of individual isolates (species) per given order and family. Species richness was calculated as the total number of species per 30 X 30 m plot. The density of species was determined by the following formula [111]

$$\text{Density of macrofungi sp. (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total no. of individuals of a particular species}}{\text{Total no. of species}} \times 100$$

Diversity indices, widely used to measure biological diversity [75] such as Shannon, and Simpson diversity indices noted below were used.

Comment [AM21]: stop personalizing

$$\text{Shannon Index } (H) = - \sum_{i=1}^s p_i \ln p_i$$

$$\text{Simpson Index } (1 - D) = 1 - 1 / \sum_{i=1}^s p_i^2$$

p is the proportion (n/N) of individuals of one particular species found (n) divided by the total number of individuals found (N), \ln is the natural log, Σ is the sum of the calculations, and s is the number of species.

Pair T-test ANOVA at a 95% confidence level between means using SPSS version 20 software was performed for species richness, density, Simpson and Shannon diversity indices to find out if there is a significant effect of seasonality on macrofungi species.

Soil analysis

Each soil property was specifically analyzed by particular analytical methods and procedures.

Calcium and Magnesium were analyzed using the atomic absorption spectrophotometer (AAS) on a mehlich 1 extracts. **Potassium and Sodium** were analyzed using the Flame photometer on the same mehlich 1 extract, **Available phosphorus** content was determined using a spectrophotometer at 882 nm wavelength after the mehlich 1 extracts reaction with ammonium molybdate in the presence of ascorbic acid [76]. **Soil pH** was measured in a soil-water solution at a ratio of 1:2.5 by the help of a pH meter; **Total Nitrogen (N)** was determined calorimetrically at a wave length of 655 nm on the complexed digestions mixtures using N1 and N2 reagents. (Reagents in N1 include; sodium salicylate, sodium citrate, sodium tartrate and sodium nitroprusside, N2 reagents include; sodium hydroxide and sodium hypochlorite (JIK) mixed in the stipulated proportions by [77]. **Organic matter (O.M)** was determined using the Walkley and Black method following wet oxidation using concentrated Sulphuric acid and Potassium Dichromate. **Soil texture** was analysed using the hydrometer method (Bouyoucous method). All analyzes were performed using routine procedures described by [77] and other internationally recommended standard operating

Comment [AM22]: subscript

Comment [AM23]: ditto

procedures (SOPs). To assess the correlation between the physicochemical properties of the soil and the abundance of macrofungi species, correlation analysis by using SPSS software was done. The abundance of species was determined by the following formulas [78].

$$\text{Abund. of macrofungi sp. (\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of individuals of the species in the site}}{\text{Total number of individuals of all species in the site}} \times 100$$

Result

Diversity of the macrofungal community within Mpanga forest

A total of 120 species of basidiomycetous macrofungi distributed in 53 genera were recorded.

Among these genera, the most dominant are *Psathyrella* and *Marasmius* respectively

represented by 11 and 9 species while those like *Tremalla*, *Neofavolus*, *Daedaleopsis*, *Trametes*, *Hexagonia*, *Oligoporus*, *Ganoderma*, *Cantharellus*, *Hymenagaricus*, *Micropsalliota*, *Amanita*, *Parasola*, *Cystolepiota*, *Volvariella*, *Cortinarius*, *Claudopus*, *Rhodocybe*, *Panus*, *Pleurotus*, *Neonothopanus*, *Cuphophyllus*, *Cystoderma*, *Lentinula*, *Lactocollybia*, *Oudemansiella* are all represented by 1 species (**Appendix.1**).

The 53 genera of macrofungi belong to 22 families and 9 orders. The majority of identified species belong to Marasmiaceae (20 species) followed by Coprinaceae (17 species) while Dermolomataceae, Pluteaceae, Amanitaceae, Cantharellaceae, Fomitopsidaceae and Auriculariaceae are represented by a single species (**Fig.5**). Among the 9 orders, the most abundant was that of Tricholomatales (55 species) followed by Agaricales and Polyporales represented by 34 and 16 species respectively (**Fig.6**).




Fig5. Families and amplexness of macrofungi species in Mpanga Fores




Fig6. Orders and amplexness of macrofungi species in Mpanga Forest



Photo 2. The 22 families of macrofungi listed represented by one species: 1. *Cantharellus* sp. (Cantharellaceae); 2. *Oligoporus ptychogaster* (Fomitopsidaceae); 3. *Panus fulvus*

(Tricholomataceae); 4. *Auricularia delicata* (Auriculariaceae); 5. *Agaricus arvensis* (Agaricaceae); 6. *Marasmius rotula* (Marasmiaceae); 7. *Cortinarius humicola* (Cortinariaceae); 8. *Tremella fuciformis* (Tremellaceae); 9. *Volvariella volvacea* (Pluteaceae); 10. *Polyporus tenuiculus* (Polyporaceae); 11. *Coprinellus* sp. (Coprinaceae); 12. *Ganoderma applanatum* (Ganodermataceae); 13. *Amanita sinicoflava* (Amanitaceae); 14. *Entoloma conferendum* (Entolomataceae); 15. *Pleurotus ostreatus* (Pleurotaceae); 16. *Gymnopus ocior* (Omphalotaceae); 17. *Hygrocybe colemanniana* (Hygrophoraceae); 18. *Macrolepiota africana* (Lepiotaceae); 19. *Termitomyces robustus* (Termitomycetaceae); 20. *Mycena rapiolens* (Mycenaceae); 21. *Cystoderma amianthinum* (Dermolomataceae); 22. *Russula virescens* (Russulaceae).

Ecological distribution of macrofungi


The results of this preliminary study on the diversity of basidiomycetous macrofungi showed that the Mpanga forest abounds in considerable macrofungal biodiversity with 120 species harvested in just two rainy seasons. During these two rainy seasons, the majority of macrofungi collected belonged to the group of saprophytes. Macrofungal species collected during the second rainy season were more abundant and diverse than those collected during the first rainy season.

From the collected macrofungi species, the saprophyte group largely dominates with 79% followed by the ectomycorrhizal symbiont group, while the symbiont group with termites and the parasitic group are poorly represented with 3% and 1% respectively (**Fig.7**). Depending on the substrate they decompose, the group of saprophytes is dominated by humicolous species which decompose soil organic matter (60%), followed respectively by saprophytic species of litter which decompose dead leaves, twigs, and other plant debris (25%) and lignicolous species which decompose dead wood's organic matter (15%) (**Fig.8**).

By considering the ecological distribution of macrofungi in the 4 prospected sites, **Fig.9** shows that the saprophyte group still remains dominant in all sites, but this dominance is more pronounced in sites 1 and 3 with 45 and 31 species respectively. These sites (Sites 1 and 3) are however very poor in ectomycorrhizal symbiont species with 2 species in each, while Site 2 harbors the largest number of ectomycorrhizal symbiont species (10 species) followed by Site 4 (7 species). As for species symbionts with termites, they are represented by a single species in sites 1, 3 and 4, and absent in site 2 while the only parasitic species collected was found in site 3.

Fig7. Ecological distribution of macrofungi in Mpanga forest

Comment [AM24]: shift it down






Fig 8 Distribution of saprophytic macrofungi according to their substrate




Fig9. Ecological distribution of macrofungi within the four prospected sites

Influence of seasonality on the diversity

The harvest of macrofungi was more fruitful during the second rainy season with 101 species against 69 species during the first rainy season. Fifty species were present in the second rainy season only and 18 species were present in the first rainy season only, while 51 species were present both in the first and second rainy seasons (**Appendix.2**). Moreover, by comparing the values of the diversity indices of Simpson and Shannon during the first rainy season (0.97 &

3.94) and those during the second rainy season (0.99 & 4.44), the values of the latter are significantly higher ($P < 0.05$). Macrofungi density and species richness were also significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher during the second rainy season than during the first one (Table.1).

Table 1. Statistical test of significance on species richness, density, and diversity indices during the two rainy seasons

Parameters	Seasons	Measured values \pm SD	t value	df	P value
Species richness (m)	First season	5.75 \pm 2.094	- 4.392	11	0.001*
	Second season	8.42 \pm 3.528			
Density (m ²)	First season	17.71 \pm 15.255	- 3.690	68	0.000*
	Second season	30.06 \pm 21.640			
Simpson diversity	First season	0.97 \pm 10.526	8,564	897,36	0.000*
	Second season	0.99 \pm 20.223			
Shannon diversity	First season	3.94 \pm 10.526	- 17. 613	1090.9	0.000*
	Second season	4.44 \pm 20.223			

*Significant difference ($P < 0.05$)

Relationship between the physicochemical properties of the soil and the abundance of macrofungi species

The correlation between the physicochemical properties of the soil and the abundance of macrofungi species only concerned species having the soil as direct substrate (37 species) in order to obtain convincing results.

Generally, the physicochemical properties of the soil of Mpanga forest vary from one site to another, except for silt, the percentage of which is constant at 12% in each of the 4 prospected sites. Apart from the silt, the result of the correlation between the other soil factors and the abundance of the 37 species of macrofungi showed that 16 species were significantly correlated with certain soil factors (Appendix.3). Among these factors, sodium (Na) was significantly correlated with the most species such as *Macrolepiota dolichaula* (-0.951), *Arrhenia obscurata* (-0.995), *Lentinus* sp. (0.986), *Lactarius indigo* (0.988), *Termitomyces microcarpus* (0.965) and *Hygrocybe colemanniana* (0.975). As for calcium (Ca), it was significantly correlated with 3 species which are *Cuphophyllus virgineus* (-0.998), *Tetrapyrgos nigripes* (-0.962) and *Clitocybe fragrans* (-0.983) while clay was significantly correlated with two species which are *Termitomyces clypeatus* (-0.986) and *Clitocybe phaeophthalma* (-0.986). The other parameters were each significantly correlated with a single

species of macrofungi. This is the case of potassium (K) with *Inocybe sindonia* (0.953), nitrogen (N) with *Arrhenia velutipes* (0.994), organic carbon (OC) with *Arrhenia velutipes* (0.986), organic matter (OM) with *Arrhenia velutipes* (0.986), phosphorus (P) with *Rhodocybe* sp. (0.976), pH with *Russula aurea* (-0.953) and sand with *Termitomyces clypeatus* (0.986).

DISCUSSION

Our study revealed that the Mpanga forest is composed of a diverse community of basidiomycetous macrofungi comprising 120 species distributed in 53 genera and 22 families. A similar study conducted in Bwindi Impenetrable and Kibale National Parks, Albertine Rift, Western Uganda reported 173 species [43] while that conducted in Southwestern region of Uganda, specifically in Malabigambo and Namalala Forest Reserves reported only 10 species [42]. The later was carried out in an area similar to ours despite the low number of species recorded. This difference is explained by the many forest gaps caused by the encroachment and overexploitation of timber in the forest reserves of Malabigambo and Namalala [42] while Mpanga forest is one of the few well-managed government reserves in Mpigi district [48], although there are still gaps in cooperation between the community and the forest management staff. In other tropical African countries, similar studies have also been carried out, but in larger forest areas than ours. This is the case of Cameroon where [79] recorded 177 species in the Mount Cameroon region and that of Kenya where [38] recorded 224 species in the Kereita and Kikuyu Escarpment forests. These results show that in forest areas that have not undergone excessive deforestation, the larger the area, the more fruitful the harvesting of macrofungi.

Our results also revealed that the majority of the species collected belong to the *Marasmius* and *Psathyrella* genera belonging to the most dominant families (Marasmiaceae and Coprinaceae), and the most dominant orders (Tricholomatales and Agaricales). These results are consistent with the nature of our study site which is a tropical moist semi-deciduous forest with *Celtis* whose fall of its dead leaves constitutes a moist litter enriching the soil with black humus, conducive to the development of macrofungi belonging to the genera *Psathyrella* and *Marasmius*. Moreover, since the greatest number of macrofungi species was collected in the middle of the rainy seasons, the dominance of species belonging to the Coprinaceae family is normal because they need heavy rains to appear and develop [67].

79% of the macrofungi recorded in the Mpanga forest were saprophytic, mostly colonizing the litter, wood, and soil organic substrates. This could be attributed to the ability of saprophytic macrofungi to degrade many types of substrates present in the forest [80]. These

Comment [AM25]:

Comment [AM26R25]: Please take note of the following:

1. Your results presentation is not concise.
2. Some points/ figures presented here are not needed
3. There is no need to present the statistics table, you only make reference and highlight with it.
4. There is need to revised the way you presented the result to be concise, coherent and clear.
5. The table you inserted is not the standard way of presenting it.
6. The way you title your figures does not conform to the standard, correct it.

Comment [AM27]: You don't personalize!

Comment [AM28]: Not allow

Comment [AM29]: You don't start sentence with figure

results are consistent with the dominance of species belonging to the Marasmiaceae and Coprinaceae families, which are saprophytic species decomposing mainly litter-based substrates. They are mainly favored by the presence of dead twigs and leaf substrates while others occur on cow dung [38]. Similar results have been found by several authors who noted that saprophytic macrofungi were the dominant macrofungal group in tropical forests [78, 81, 82, 83]. By comparing the ecological distribution of macrofungi in the 4 prospected sites, the dominance of the group of saprophytes is confirmed especially in sites 1 and 3 rich in Cannabaceae, in particular, the genus *Celtis* while in sites 2 and 4, a single species differentiated the saprophytic groups from those of the ectomycorrhizal symbionts. Our results corroborate those of several studies which have shown that species belonging to the genus *Celtis* are part of the forest species that allow tropical forests to produce a great diversity of wood and leaves resulting in a multitude of substrates favorable to the development of saprophytic macrofungi [83, 84, 85]. As for the difference observed in sites 2 and 4, it can be explained by the fact that these sites are characterized by vegetation rich in Euphorbiaceae which is a family strongly involved in symbiotic associations with macrofungi [86]. The low representation of ectomycorrhizal macrofungi species observed during the entire collection could be linked to the tropical nature of Mpanga because, in China, studies have shown that ectomycorrhizal macrofungi were more diversified in temperate forests than in tropical forests [82, 78].

Statistical tests of significance on species richness, density and diversity indices during the two rainy seasons showed that the diversity of macrofungi was higher during the second rainy season than during the first. This difference in diversity could be explained by the fact that there is enough humidity available during the second rainy season which is the rainiest since humidity is one of the main factors influencing fruiting macrofungi. This corresponds with the conclusions of [79] in the Mount Cameroon region, [87], in the southern part of Cameroon, [88] in southern Ghana, [89] and [90] who worked on the diversity of macrofungi in semi-evergreen humid deciduous forest in Shimoga-Ksrnataka district, India. It was also found that some species of macrofungi were present in both rainy seasons, while others were only present in the first or second rainy season. These results could be due to differences in the time between the appearance of favorable fruiting conditions and the production of fruit bodies between the different species of macrofungi studied, as noted by [79]. This agrees with the findings of [91], who studied substrate specificity and community phenology of macrofungi in Tanzania. During the collection period, it was noted that generally small, delicate and fragile species with small thread-like stipes of litter-dwelling genera such as

Comment [AM30]: Delete

Comment [AM31]: Space

Coprinus, *Marasmius* and *Mycena*, fruited following heavy rains. These species came and went very quickly while the tall fruiting bodies fructified after a continuous period of rains lasting several days. The same observation was made by [67] and [79], and similar results were also found by [92], who noted that most macrofungi require a period of vegetative growth prior to fruiting during which mycelia accumulate before being triggered to fruit.

Our results also showed that fleshy macrofungi were dominant during the second rainy season while during the first rainy season, non-fleshy macrofungi (polypores) were dominant (**Appendix 2**). Since the second rainy season is rainier than the first, the dominance of fleshy macrofungi could be explained by the fact that this period is favorable for their production. During this period, adequate humidity, favorable temperature, relative humidity and sunshine help macrofungi to decompose dead organic matter [93]. As for the dominance of polypores during the first rainy season, it could be due to the decrease in precipitation and relative humidity, the increase in temperature and sunshine which most of the fleshy macrofungi cannot withstand [79]. It was also noted that species like *Volvariella volvacea* among other species (**Appendix 2**) showed no seasonal variation but were present in both seasons. Similar results were also recorded by [87].

Correlation results showed that pH, calcium, potassium, nitrogen, organic carbon, phosphorus, clay, sand, and organic matter were significantly correlated with macrofungal species abundance. Similar results were recorded by [42] on the study of the ecology of edible indigenous macrofungi from Lake Victoria Basin, Uganda. Other authors such as [94], [95] and [96], have also demonstrated the existence of an edaphic preference of many macrofungi in tropical forests. [97] and [98] noted that sandy loam texture, low soil bulk density, high organic matter and pH were properties that stimulated the development of macrofungi. The importance of organic matter is due to its water holding capacity and nutrient availability [99]. [97] and [99] also noted that acid soils combined with a high content of organic matter stimulates the decay function of macrofungi compared to other microorganisms such as bacteria and actinomycetes. The soils of our study site were generally acidic, which is consistent with the findings of [100] and [101] in their studies conducted in tropical regions.

CONCLUSION

The results of this preliminary study on the diversity of basidiomycetous macrofungi showed that the Mpanga forest abounds in considerable macrofungal biodiversity with 120 species harvested just in two rainy seasons. During these seasons, the majority of the species that have been collected belong to the group of saprophytes. Macrofungi species collected during

Comment [AM32]: Ditto

Comment [AM33]: Your discussion is more of results repetition. You need to focus your discussion on how and why, not just to mention and repeat. Therefore, discussion need to be revised and focus on the important points.

the second rainy season were more abundant and diverse than those collected during the first rainy season. Among the physicochemical properties of the soil, pH, calcium, potassium, nitrogen, organic carbon, phosphorus, clay, sand and organic matter were significantly correlated with the abundance of macrofungal species.

This study provided basic information on the diversity of macrofungi in Mpanga forest, it can be a point of reference for further research to study the evolution of macrofungal biodiversity in this forest. Moreover, the importance of macrofungi not only in the dynamics of forest ecosystems but also in human nutrition and health increases the need for conservation of this resource of non-timber forest products. Conservation can also be achieved through their cultivation and the reduction of illegal logging hence the need to include macrofungal biodiversity conservation in forest management policies in Uganda.

Comment [AM34]: It seems you combine conclusion and recommendation. You need to separate the two, because the way you presented it looks like a combination of the two. If, it is conclusion you mean, you can draw conclusion on what you have not done.

REFERENCES

1. Kirk, P. M., Cannon, P. F., David, J. C & Stalpers, J.A. (2001). Ainsworth & Bisby Dictionary of mushrooms. 9th edition, CABI Publishing, 42p.
2. Da Silva, E. J., (2005). Mushroom in medicine and culture. *Int. J. Med. Mushrooms* 7:75-78.
3. Lodge, D. J., Ammirati, J. F., O'Dell, T. E., & Mueller, M. G., (2004). Collecting and describing macrofungi. Pp 128–158.
4. Redhead, S., (1997). Standardized inventory methodologies for components of British Columbia's biodiversity: *Macrofungi*. Resource inventory committee, Vancouver.
5. Seen-Irlet, B., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Genney, D., & Dahlberg, A., (2007). Guidance for the conservation of mushrooms in Europe. Convention on the conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats. 27th meeting, Strasbourg, 26-29 November, 34p.
6. Koné, A. N., Yéo, K., Konaté, S., & Linsenmair, E. K. (2013). Socio-economical

Comment [AM35]: Your reference should be APA style 7th Edition, except if you told to use another format the journal guide. Your content citation need to be considered as well. All journals name should be in italics

Comment [AM36]: Italics

- aspect of the exploitation of termitomyces fruit bodies in central and southern Ivory Coast: Raising awareness for their sustainable use, *J. Appl. Biosci.* 70 : 5580 – 5590.
7. Yorou, N. S., De Kesel, A., Sinsin, B., & Codjia, J. T. C. (2002a). Diversité et productivité des champignons comestibles de la forêt classée de Wari-Marou (Bénin, Afrique de l'Ouest). Proceedings of XVIth AETFAT Congress, Brussels 2000. *Systematic and Geographic of Plants* 71: 613 - 625.
 8. Yorou, S. N., De Kesel, A., Codjia, J.T.C., & Sinsin, B. (2002b). Biodiversité des champignons comestibles du Bénin. Proceedings of the Symposium-Workshop on Biodiversity in Benin. Abomey-Calavi (Benin) October 30th to November 18th 2002, pp 231 - 240.
 9. Rammeloo, J. & Walley, R. (1993). The edible fungi of South Africa of the Sahara: a literature survey, *Script. Bot. Belg.* 5: 1-62.
 10. Ibrahim, D., Hama, O., Daniels, P. P., Inoussa, M. M., Barage, M., Adam, T., ... & Infante, F. (2017). Diversité des champignons basidiomycètes à carpophores inféodés à certaines espèces des Caesalpiniaceae du Parc National du W du Niger (Afrique de l'Ouest). *Journal of Applied Biosciences*, 116, 11566-11576.
 11. Tapwal, A., Kumar, R., & Pandey, S. (2013). Diversity and frequency of macrofungi associated with wet ever green tropical forest in Assam, India. *Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity*, 14(2).
 12. Boa, E.R. (2004). Wild edible fungi: a global overview of their use and importance to people. Food & Agriculture Org.
 13. Bâ, A. M., Duponnois, R., & Diabaté, M. B. Dreyfus. (2011). Les champignons ectomycorrhiziens des arbres forestiers en Afrique de l'Ouest. Méthodes d'étude, diversité, écologie, utilisation en foresterie et comestibilité. Editions IRD, 264 p.
 14. Ducouso, M., Bâ, A. M., & Thoen, D. (2003). Les champignons ectomycorrhiziens des forêts naturelles et des Plantations d'Afrique de l'Ouest : Une source de champignons comestibles. *Bois Forêts Trop.* N° 275 (1): 51 - 63.
 15. Yorou, N. S., Koné, N. A., Guelly, A., Guissou, M. L., Maba D. L., Ekué, M., & De Kesel, A. (2013). Biodiversity and sustainable use of Wild Edible Fungi in the Soudanian Center of Endemism. A plea for valorisation. In Bâ et al (eds). *Ectomycorrhizae in the Tropics and Neotropics*. Science Publisher, pp 241 - 269.
 16. De Kesel, A., Codja, J. T. C., & Yorou, N. S. (2002). Guide des champignons comestibles du Bénin, Coco multimédia, Cotonou, Bénin, 274 p.

17. Guissou, M. L. (2005). Les Macromycètes du Burkina Faso : inventaire, ethnomycologie, valeur nutritionnelle et thérapeutique de quelques espèces. Thèse de doctorat de L'Université de Ouagadougou, 187p.
18. Oso, B. A. (1975). Mushrooms and the Yoruba people of Nigeria. *Mycologia*, 67: 311-319.
19. Oso, B. A. (1977a). Mushrooms in Yoruba Mythology and Medicinal Practices. *Economic Botany*, 31: 367-371.
20. Oso, B. A. (1977b). *Pleurotus tuberregium* from *Mycologia*, 69 : 271-279.
21. Raven, P. H., Evert, R. F., & Eichhorn, S. E. (2007). Biologie végétale, 2eme Edition, Groupe De Boeck s.a, Paris, pp.510-557.
22. Hawksworth, D.L. & Lücking, R. (2017). Fungal diversity revisited: 2.2 to 3.8 million species.
23. Wasser, S. P. (2002). Medicinal mushrooms, as a source of antitumor and immunomodulating polysaccharides. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, 60: 256-274.
24. Raven, P. H., Johnson, G. J., Mason, K. A., Losos, J. B., & Singer, S. S. (2011). Biologie. 2^{ème} edition. Ed. De Boeck, Bruxelles, 1406p.
25. Kamou, H. Gbogbo, K. A., Yorou, n. S., Nadjombe, P., Abalo-Loko, A. G., Verbeken, A., & Guelly, k. A. (2017a). Inventaire préliminaire de macromycetes du Parc National Fazao-Malfakassa du Togo, Afrique de l'Oust. *Tropicultura*, 35 : 275-287.
26. Kamou, H., Nadjombe, P., Gbogbo, A. K., Yorou, S. N., Batawila, K., Akpagana, K., & Guelly, K. A. (2017b). Les champignons ectomycorrhiziens consommés par les Bassar et les kabyé, peuples riverains du Parc National Fzao-Malfakassa (PNFM) au Togo (Afrique de l'Ouest). *Revue Marocaine des Sciences Agronomiques et Vétérinaires*, 5 : 154 - 162.
27. Khady, N., Maimouna, K., Adidja, M. W., Abdalah, F., & Kandioura, N. (2018). Contribution to the Knowledge of Fungal Biodiversity in Senegal by a Study of Basidiomycete Species of the Order of Agaricales in the Dakar Region. *Annual Research & Review in Biology*, 1-12.
28. Guelly, K.A., Dourma, M., Kamou, H., Koda, D.K., Wala, K., & Akpagana, K. (2019). Diversité des champignons saprotrophes et ectomycorrhiziens du campus universitaire de Lomé au Togo, *Rev. Mar. Sci. Agron. Vét.* (2019) 7(4) : 571-579.
29. Nankone, S., Sanon, E., Dabire, K., Sawadogo, B. R., & Guissou, K. M. L. (2021). Etude taxonomique de trois espèces de polypores parasites des essences forestières à l'Ouest du Burkina Faso. *Afrique SCIENCE*, 19(1), 1-11.

30. Kinge, T. R., Goldman, G., Jacobs, A., Ndiritu, G. G., & Gryzenhout, M. (2020). A first checklist of macrofungi for South Africa. *MycoKeys*, 63, 1.
31. Beeli, M. (1935). [Amanita, Volvariella] Flore Iconographique des champignons du Congo, 1 – 28, pl. 1 – 4. Fondation Universitaire de Belgique, Fondation A. De Potter et Jardin Botanique de l'état et de la Société Royale de Botanique de Belgique.
32. JBNB. (1989). Flore iconographique des champignons du Congo. Ministère de l'agriculture, Belgique, 335 p.
33. Pegler, D. N. (1977). A preliminary agaric flora of East Africa. *Kew Bulletin Additional Series* 6, 615 pp.
34. Awana, N. O., Tchunte, A. N. T., & Kuyper, T. W. (2018). Biodiversité des macrochampignons sauvages comestibles de la forêt humide du Sud-Cameroun. *BOIS & FORETS DES TROPIQUES*, 338, 87-99.
35. Malale, H. N. S. W. (2018). Macrofungal diversity in Yangambi Biosphere reserve and Yoko reserve rainforests of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *International Journal of Biodiversity and Conservation*, 10(9), 348-356.
36. Njouonkou, A. L., Njapdounké, G. V., Yumdinguetmun, R., Tsopmbeng, G. N., & Degreef, J. (2021). Étude comparative de la diversité des macrochampignons dans les plantations forestières matures d'eucalyptus et de pins en zone de savanes tropicales à l'Ouest du Cameroun. *Écoscience*, 28(1), 53-65.
37. Munyaneza, E. (2018). Diversity and ecology of wild mushrooms of Riparian zone of Lake Kivu, Rwanda.
38. Kabacia, S. N. (2018). *Effect of Land Use on Diversity of Macrofungi in Kereita Forest, Kikuyu Escarpment and the Potential of Cultivation of Selected Species* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
39. Muchane, M. N., Waithaka, K. M., & Terer, T. (2021). Macro-fungi Community of Lake Ol Bolossat Basin and Associated Riparian Ecosystems in Central, Kenya. *International Journal of Natural Resource Ecology and Management*, 6(1), 6.
40. Buyck, B. (1994b). Ubwoba : Les champignons comestibles de l'ouest du Burundi. Brussels, Administration Générale de la Coopération au Développement : 123 p.
41. Katende, A.B., Segawa, P. & Birnie A. (1999). Wild food plants and mushrooms of Uganda, Nairobi, Kenya, Regional Land Management Unit, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency: 490 p.

42. Engola, A. P. O., Eilu, G., Kabasa, J. D., Kisovi, L., Munishi, P. K. T., & Olila, D. (2007). Ecology of edible indigenous mushrooms of the Lake Victoria basin (Uganda). *Res J Biol Sci*, 2(1), 62-68.
43. Ipulet, P. (2007). Ecology and Diversity of pore Fungi (Aphyllophorales) in Bwindi Impenetrable and Kibale National Parks, Albertine Rift, Western Uganda. A Thesis submitted for the fulfilment of the requirement for the award of the degree of doctor of philosophy of Makerere University.
44. Nature Trails East Africa (NTEA) (2014). WordPress, 1p (available: <http://www.eastafricantrails.com/mpanga-forest/>).
45. Dawkins, H.C. & Philip, M.S. (1962). Working Plan for Mpanga Forest Research, Forest Department, Uganda Protectorate, Government Printer, Entebbe.
46. Lwanga, J. (1996a). Chapter 3 – Trees and Shrubs. In: Davenport, T., Howard, P., Dickinson, C. (ed.). Mpanga, Zika and Mpigi District Forest Reserves Biodiversity Report, Unpublished paper from the Forest Department Uganda: 18–38.
47. Taylor, D. M., Hamilton, A. C., Whyatt, J. D., Mucunguzi, P., & Bukenya-Ziraba, R. (1996). Stand dynamics in Mpanga Research Forest Reserve, Uganda, 1968–1993. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 12(4), 583-597.
48. Taylor, D., Hamilton, A. C., Lewis, S. L., & Nantale, G. (2008). Thirty-eight years of change in a tropical forest: plot data from Mpanga Forest Reserve, Uganda. *African Journal of Ecology*, 46(4), 655-667.
49. Baron, T., Akite, P., Barnett, M., Collins, S. C., Dobson, J., Fric, Z. F., ... & Ward, P. (2017). The second Afrotropical Lepidoptera Workshop in Uganda. A contribution to the Lepidoptera fauna of Kibale National Park and the Mpanga Forest Reserve. *Entomologische Zeitschrift, Schwanfeld*, 127(2), 77-105.
50. Sáfián, S., & Pycz, T. (2020). Further data on the butterfly fauna (Lepidoptera: Papilionoidea) of Mpanga Forest, Uganda, and the role of this forest in biodiversity conservation. *Metamorphosis*, 31(1).
51. Taligoola, H. K., & Whalley, A. J. S. (1976). The genus *Hypoxylo* in Uganda forests. *Transactions of the British Mycological Society*, 67(3), 517-519.
52. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (NEMA) (2016). National biodiversity strategy and action plan ii (2015-2025): Supporting Transition to a Middle-Income Status and Delivery of Sustainable Development Goals. NEMA House Plot 17/19/21 Jinja Road P.O. Box 22255 Kampala Uganda., 16: 1-124.
53. Obua, J., Agea, J. G. & Ogwal, J. J (2010). Status of forests in Uganda. *African*

- Journal of Ecology, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Afr. J. Ecol. 2010.
54. Anon. (1967). Atlas of Uganda. Department of Lands and Survey, Uganda.
 55. Thomas, A.S. (1945). The vegetation of some hillsides in Uganda. *J. Ecol*, 33, 2
 56. Langdale, B. I. (1960). The Vegetation of Buganda. Memoirs of the Research Division (Series 2), Department of Agriculture, Uganda Protectorate.
 57. Search Lonely Planet (SLP) (2017). 1p (available: <https://www.lonelyplanet.com/uganda/attractions/mpanga-forest-reserve/a/poi-sig/1460755/355692>).
 58. Nature Trails East Africa (NTEA) (2014). WordPress, 1p (available: <http://www.eastafricantrails.com/mpanga-forest/>).
 59. Turyahabwe, N. & Tweheyo, M. (2010.) Does Forest tenure influence forest vegetation characteristics? A comparative analysis of private, local and central government forest reserves in central Uganda, *International Forestry Review* Vol.12 (4).
 60. Blanchard, P., Diaz, E., Gruhn, G., Rose, O., Voiry, H., Courtecuisse, R., & Moreau, PA. (2016). Mycological Inventory Protocol in Tropical Forests, Forestry Files No. 29, National Office of forests, 114 p. No. ISBN: 978-2-84207-500-8.
 61. Natarajan, K., Senthilarasu, G., Kumaresan, V., & Riviere, T. (2005). Diversity in ectomycorrhizal fungi of a dipterocarp forest in Western Ghats. *Current Science*, 88(12), 1893-1895.
 62. Eyi-Ndong, H., Degreef, J., & De Kesel, A. (2011). Champignons comestibles des forêts denses d'Afrique centrale. *Taxonomie et identification. ABC Taxa*, 10, 253.
 63. Yorou, S. N., De Kesel, A., Sinsin, B. & Codjia, J. T. C. (2001), Diversité et productivité des champignons comestibles de la forêt classée de Wari-Marou, *Systematics and Geography of Plants*, Vol. 71, No. 2, Plant Systematics and Phytogeography for the Understanding of African Biodiversity (2001), pp. 613-625.
 64. Mueller, G. M., Schmit, J. P., Ryvardeen, S. M. H. L., O'Dell, T. E., Lodge, D. J., Leacock, P. R., ... & Czederpiltz, D. L. (2004). Recommended protocols for sampling macrofungi. *Biodiversity of fungi: inventory and monitoring methods. Amsterdam; Boston: Elsevier Academic Press, c2004: Pages [168]-172*.
 65. Courtecuisse, R. (2006). Liste préliminaire des Fungi recensés dans les îles françaises des Petites Antilles : Martinique, Guadeloupe et dépendances. I – Basidiomycètes lamellés et affines (Agaricomycetidae s.l.). *Doc. Mycol.* 133-134, p. 79-136.

66. Ryvarden, L. (1991). Genera of polypores. Nomenclature and taxonomy. *Synopsis Fungorum* 5, 363 p.
67. Kane, M. (2014). Contribution to the systematic study of the superior fungi of the sporophore of Senegal. PhD Thesis, Specialty: Systematic Botany, February 2014: 4p.
68. Roger, P. (1981). Les champignons. Eds. Solar pour la traduction française, Paris, 288 p.
69. Romagnesi, H. (1995). Atlas des champignons d'Europe. Ed. Bordas, Paris, 290 p.
70. Heim, R. (1958), Termitomyces, *Iconographic flora of Congo fungi* 7: 139-151, pl. 23-25.
71. Horak, E. & Heinemann, P. (1978). Pluteus (Pluteaceae). Volvariella (Pluteaceae), Compléments. Flore Illustrée des Champignons d'Afrique Centrale 6. Jardin Botanique National de Belgique, Bruxelles, p. 105-120, pl. 17-19.
72. Ozenda, P. (2000). Les Végétaux (organisation et diversité biologique). Ed Dunod, Paris. p 85-168. 516 p.
73. Champon, B. (2009). Clef d'identification systématique.
74. Chaboud, A. (2013). Impact de l'approche moléculaire sur la classification systématique des Agaricomycetidae.
75. Magurran, A.E. (2004). Measuring Biological Diversity, *African Journal of Aquatic Science* 29, pp. 285-286.
76. Murphy, J., & Riley, I. P. (1962). A modified single solution method for the determination of phosphate in natural waters. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 27:31-6, [Department of Oceanography. University of Liverpool, England.
77. Okalebo, J. R., Gathua, K.W., & Woome, P. L. (2002). Laboratory Methods of Soil and Plant Analysis: A working Manual. Second Edition. TSBF-CIAT and SACRED Africa, Nairobi, Kenya. p128.
78. Li, H., Guo, J., Karunarathna, S. C., Ye, L., Xu, J., Hyde, K. D., & Mortimer, P. E. (2018). Native forests have a higher diversity of macrofungi than comparable plantation forests in the Greater Mekong Subregion. *Forests*, 9(7), 402.
79. Egbe, E., Tonjock, R. K., Ebai, M. T., Nji, T., & Afui, M. M. (2013). Diversity and distribution of macrofungi (mushrooms) in the Mount Cameroon Region. *Journal of Ecology and The Natural Environment*, 5(10), 318-334.
80. Lynch, M.D. & Thorn, R.G. (2006). "Diversity of basidiomycetes in Michigan agricultural soils" *Applied and environmental microbiology* 72(11): 7050-7056.

81. Osono, T. (2015). Diversity, resource utilization, and phenology of fruiting bodies of litter-decomposing macrofungi in subtropical, temperate, and subalpine forests. *Journal of forest research*, 20(1), 60-68.
82. Shi, L. L., Mortimer, P. E., Ferry Slik, J. W., Zou, X. M., Xu, J., Feng, W. T., & Qiao, L. (2014). Variation in forest soil fungal diversity along a latitudinal gradient. *Fungal Diversity*, 64(1), 305-315.
83. Lodge, D. J. (1997). Factors related to diversity of decomposer fungi in tropical forests. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, 6(5), 681-688.
84. Paulus, B., & Gadek, P. (2003). Estimation of microfungal diversity in tropical rainforest leaf litter using particle filtration: the effects of leaf storage and surface treatment. *Mycological research*, 107(6), 748-756.
85. Aung, O. M., Soyong, K., & Hyde, K. D. (2008). Diversity of entomopathogenic fungi in rainforests of Chiang Mai Province, Thailand. *Fungal Diversity*, 30, 15-22.
86. Thoen, D. & Ducouso M. (1989). Fouta Djallon mushrooms and ectomycorrhizae, *Revue Bois et Forêts des Tropiques*, 221: 45-63.
87. Dijk, H.V., Onguene, N.A., Kuyper, T.W. (2003). Knowledge and utilization of edible mushrooms by local populations of the rain forest of South Cameroon. *Ambio* 32:19-23.
88. Apetorgbor, M.M., Apetorgbor, A.K., Nutakor, E. (2005). Utilization and cultivation of edible mushrooms for rural livelihood in Southern Ghana. 17th Commonwealth Forestry Conference Colombo, Sri Lanka 22p.
89. Brown, N., Bhagwat, S., Watkinson, S. (2006). Macrofungal diversity in fragmented and disturbed forests of the Western Ghats of India. *J. Appl. Ecol* 43:11-17.
90. Swapna, S., Syed, A., Krishnappa, M. (2008). Diversity of macrofungi in semi-evergreen and moist deciduous forest of Shimoga District-Karnataka, India. *J. Mycol. Plant Pathol.* 38(1):21-26.
91. Tibuhwa, D.D. (2011). Substrate specificity and phenology of macrofungi community at the University of Dar es Salaam main campus, Tanzania. *J. Appl. Biosci.* 46:3173-3184.
92. Gates, G.M., Mohammed, C., Wardlaw, T., Ratkowsky, D.A., Davidson, N.J. (2011). The ecology and diversity of wood-inhabiting macrofungi in a native *Eucalyptus obliqua* forest of southern Tasmania, Australia *Fungal Ecol* 4:56-67.

93. Li, H., Guo, J., Ye, L., Gui, H., Hyde, K. D., Xu, J., & Mortimer, P. E. (2021). Composition of woody plant communities drives macrofungal community composition in three climatic.
94. Gévry, M. F., Simard, D., Roy, G. (2009). Ecology and management of edible mycorrhizal mushrooms in eastern Canada.
95. Reverchon, F., María del Ortega-Larrocea, P., & Pérez-Moreno, J. (2010). Saprophytic fungal communities change in diversity and species composition across a volcanic soil chronosequence at Sierra del Chichinautzin, Mexico. *Annals of microbiology*, 60(2), 217-226.
96. Gévry, M. F. (2011). Evaluation du potentiel en champignons forestier comestibles au Lac Saint-Jean. Rapport final. Québec, 55 p.
97. Zamora, C. M & Cecilia Nieto, De P. P. (1995). Natural production of wild edible mushroom in the southwestern rural territory of Mexico City, Mexico. *For. Ecol. Mang.*, 72: 13-20.
98. Tyler, G. (1989). Edaphical distribution patterns of macrofungal species in deciduous forest of south Sweden. *Acta oecol., Oecol. Gen.*, 10(3): 309-326.
99. Bergemann, E. S & Largent, L. D. (2000). The site-specific variables that correlate with the distribution of the pacific Golden Chanterelle, (*Cantharellus formosus*). *For. Ecol. Mnage.*, 130: 99-107.
100. Ahn, P. M. (1993). Tropical soils and fertilizer use International Tropical Agriculture Series. Longman Scientific and Technical.
101. Syers, I. K. & Rimmer, D.L., Eds. (1994). Soil science and sustainable Land management in the tropics. British Society of Soil Sci. CAB International, Wallingford.

Appendix1. Systematic classification of identified species with an indication of their harvest date and geographic coordinates

Comment [AM37]: You don't need

Division	Class	Subclass	Order	Family	Genus	Species	Sample number	Harvest date	Geographic coordinates	
Basidiomycota	Phragmobasidiomycetes		Auriculariales	Auriculariaceae	<i>Auricularia</i>	<i>Auricularia delicata</i>	KN 110 MF	07 / 05/ 20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 6" E	
						<i>Auricularia auricula-judae</i>	KN 065 MF	23/ 11/20	0° 12' 19" N 32° 17' 54" E	
			Tremellales	Tremellaceae	<i>Tremalla</i>	<i>Tremalla fuciformis</i>	KN 131 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 18' 11" E	
						<i>Polyporus</i>	<i>Polyporus grammocephalus</i>	KN 032 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 5" E
	Homobasidiomycetes	Aphyllorphoromycetideae	Polyporales	Polyporaceae		<i>Polyporus badius</i>	KN 021 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 5" E	
						<i>Polyporus tenuiculus</i>	KN 183 MF	27/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 7" E	
						<i>Polyporus varius</i>	KN 193 MF	07/ 06/20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 12" E	
						<i>Neofavolus</i>	<i>Neofavolus alveolaris</i>	KN 001 MF	05/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 23" N 32° 18' 11" E
						<i>Daedaleopsis</i>	<i>Daedaleopsis confragosa</i>	KN 089 MF	14/ 12/ 20	0° 12' 2" N 32° 18' 40" E
						<i>Trametes</i>	<i>Trametes gibbosa</i>	KN 009 MF	05/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 24" N 32° 18' 11" E
						<i>Microporus</i>	<i>Microporus xanthopus</i>	KN 055 MF	09/ 11/20	0° 12' 22" N 32° 17' 58" E
							<i>Microporus affinis</i>	KN 192 MF	07/ 06/ 20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 11" E
							<i>Microporus vernicipes</i>	KN 204 MF	07/ 06/ 20	0° 12' 35" N 32° 18' 8" E
						<i>Hexagonia</i>	<i>Hexagonia tenuis</i>	KN 187 MF	27/ 05/20	0° 12' 33" N

								32° 18' 6" E	
			Fomitopsidaceae	<i>Oligoporus</i>	<i>Oligoporus ptychogaster</i>	KN 200 MF	07/ 06/ 20	0° 12' 35" N 32° 18' 9" E	
			Ganodermataceae	<i>Ganoderma</i>	<i>Ganoderma applanatum</i>	KN 066 MF	23/11/20	0° 12' 19" N 32° 17' 53" E	
				<i>Amauroderma</i>	<i>Amauroderma rude</i>	KN 189 MF	27/ 05/20	0° 12' 2" N 32° 17' 52" E	
					<i>Amauroderma</i> sp.	KN 082 MF	07/12/20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 11" E	
					<i>Amauroderma rugosum</i>	KN 195 MF	07/ 06/20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 18' 10" E	
		Cantharellales	Cantharellaceae	<i>Cantharellus</i>	<i>Cantharellus</i> sp.	KN 198 MF	07/ 06/20	0° 12' 34" N 32° 18' 10" E	
	Agarico mycetideae	Agaricales	Agaricaceae	<i>Agaricus</i>	<i>Agaricus arvensis</i>	KN 011 MF	05/ 10/20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 11" E	
					<i>Agaricus diminutivus</i>	KN 074 MF	30/11/20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 14" E	
					<i>Agaricus moelleri</i>	KN 150 MF	21/ 05/20	0° 12' 10" N 32° 17' 42" E	
				<i>Hymenagaricus</i>	<i>Hymenagaricus</i> sp.	KN 062 MF	23/11/20	0° 12' 20" N 32° 17' 54" E	
				<i>Micropsalliota</i>	<i>Micropsalliota</i> sp.	KN 035 MF	19/10/20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 5" E	
				Amanitaceae	<i>Amanita</i>	<i>Amanita sinicoflava</i>	KN 072 MF	30/11/20	0° 12' 23" N 32° 18' 11" E
				Coprinoaceae	<i>Coprinellus</i>	<i>Coprinellus disseminatus</i>	KN 053 MF	09/11/20	0° 12' 19" N 32° 17' 54" E
						<i>Coprinellus</i> sp.	KN 185 MF	27/05/ 20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 5" E
			<i>Coprinopsis</i>		<i>Coprinopsis lagopus</i>	KN 088 FM	07/12/ 20	0° 12' 40" N 32° 18' 44" E	

					<i>Coprinopsis domesticus</i>	KN 141 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 27" N 32° 18' 9" E	
					<i>Coprinopsis cinerea</i>	KN 197 MF	07/06/20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 5" E	
				<i>Parasola</i>	<i>Parasola auricoma</i>	KN 201 FM	07/06/20	0° 12' 35" N 32° 18' 9" E	
				<i>Psathyrella</i>	<i>Psathyrella tephrophylla</i>	KN 086 MF	07/12/20	0° 12' 28" N 32° 18' 37" E	
					<i>Psathyrella leucotephra</i>	KN 015 MF	12/10/20	0° 12' 1" N 32° 17' 8" E	
					<i>Psathyrella candolleana</i>	KN 045 MF	02/11/20	0° 12' 2" N 32° 17' 41" E	
					<i>Psathyrella spadiceogrisea</i>	KN 054 NF	09/11/20	0° 12' 19" N 32° 17' 54" E	
					<i>Psathyrella clivensis</i>	KN 106 MF	07/05/20	0° 12' 34" N 32° 18' 6" E	
					<i>Psathyrella inflatocystis</i>	KN 128 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 12" E	
					<i>Psathyrella conferta</i>	KN 042 MF	26/10/20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 11" E	
					<i>Psathyrella pennata</i>	KN 159 MF	21/05/20	0° 12' 10" N 32° 17' 42" E	
					<i>Psathyrella conopilus</i>	KN 136 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 11" E	
					<i>Psathyrella olympiana</i>	KN 026 MF	19/10/20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 5" E	
					<i>Psathyrella sp.</i>	KN 181 MF	27/05/20	0° 12' 11" N 32° 17' 28" E	
				<i>Lepiotaceae</i>	<i>Lepiota</i>	<i>Lepiota cristata</i>	KN 061 MF	23/11/20	0° 12' 17" N 32° 17' 54" E
						<i>Lepiota felina</i>	KN 057 MF	23/11/20	0° 12' 22" N

								32° 17' 57" E
				<i>Macrolepiota</i>	<i>Macrolepiota africana</i>	KN 030 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 24" N 32° 18' 7" E
					<i>Macrolepiota procera</i>	KN 126 MF	14/05/ 20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 12" E
					<i>Macrolepiota dolichaula</i>	KN 076 MF	30/ 11/ 20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 9" E
				<i>Cystolepiota</i>	<i>Cystolepiota pulverulenta</i>	KN 024 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 5" N 32° 18' 56" E
				<i>Leucoagaricus</i>	<i>Leucoagaricus rubrotinctus</i>	KN 014 MF	12/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 5" E
					<i>Leucoagaricus croceovelutinus</i>	KN 182 MF	27/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 13" N 32° 17' 25" E
				<i>Leucocoprinus</i>	<i>Leucocoprinus scissus</i>	KN 018 MF	12/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 6" N 32° 17' 40" E
					<i>Leucocoprinus brebissoni</i>	KN 104 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 34" N 32° 18' 7" E
				Pluteaceae	<i>Volvariella volvacea</i>	KN 155 MF	21/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 11" N 32° 18' 42" E
			Cortinariales	Cortinariaceae	<i>Cortinarius humicola</i>	KN 137 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 17' 11" E
					<i>Inocybe sindonia</i>	KN 095 MF	14/12 /20	0° 12' 2" N 32° 17' 40" E
					<i>Inocybe rimosa</i>	KN 203 MF	07/ 06/ 20	0° 12' 36" N 32° 18' 9" E
			Entolomatales	Entolomataceae	<i>Entoloma conferendum</i>	KN 083 MF	07/ 12/ 20	0° 12' 40" N 32° 18' 34" E
					<i>Entoloma</i> sp.	KN 036 MF	26/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 28" N 32° 18' 10" E
					<i>Claudopus variabilis</i>	KN 081 MF	07/ 12/ 20	0° 12' 33" N 32° 18' 12" E

			<i>Rhodocybe</i>	<i>Rhodocybe</i> sp.	KN 135 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 18' 11" E		
		Russulales	Russulaceae	<i>Russula</i>	<i>Russula aurea</i>	KN 013 MF	05 / 10/ 20	0° 12' 24" N 32° 18' 11" E	
					<i>Russula virescens</i>	KN 138 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 18' 11" E	
				<i>Lactarius</i>	<i>Lactarius chrysorrheus</i>	KN 144 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 9" E	
					<i>Lactarius indigo</i>	KN 151 MF	21/05/20	0° 12' 12" N 32° 17' 43" E	
		Tricholomatales	Tricholomataceae	<i>Tricholoma</i>	<i>Tricholoma stiparophyllum</i>	KN 068 MF	20/11/20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 5" E	
					<i>Tricholoma</i> sp. 1	KN 070 MF	20/11/20	0° 12' 24" N 32° 18' 5" E	
					<i>Tricholoma</i> sp. 2	KN 171 MF	24/05/20	0° 12' 22" N 32° 17' 55" E	
				<i>Arrhenia</i>	<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>	KN 040 MF	26/10/20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 12" E	
					<i>Arrhenia epichysium</i>	KN 134 MF	14/05/20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 18' 41" E	
					<i>Arrhenia obscurata</i>	KN 168 MF	24/05/20	0° 12' 14" N 32° 17' 53" E	
				<i>Clitocybe</i>	<i>Clitocybe phaeophthalma</i>	KN 116 MF	07/05/20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 6" E	
					<i>Clitocybe fragrans</i>	KN 107 MF	07/05/20	0° 12' 34" N 32° 18' 6" E	
					<i>Clitocybe</i> sp. 1	KN 037 MF	26/10/20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 11" E	
					<i>Clitocybe</i> sp. 2	KN 102 MF	07/05/20	0° 12' 34" N 32° 18' 7" E	
					<i>Panus</i>	<i>Panus fulvus</i>	KN 084 MF	07/12/20	0° 12' 31" N

							32° 18' 15" E	
			Termitomycetaceae	<i>Termitomyces</i>	<i>Termitomyces robustus</i>	KN 031 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 7" E
					<i>Termitomyces microcarpus</i>	KN 148 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 5" N 32° 18' 10" E
					<i>Termitomyces clypeatus</i>	KN 060 MF	23/ 11/ 20	0° 12' 23" N 32° 17' 56" E
			Pleurotaceae	<i>Pleurotus</i>	<i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i>	KN 052 MF	09/11/ 20	0° 12' 21" N 32° 17' 55" E
				<i>Lentinus</i>	<i>Lentinus tigrinus</i>	KN 165 MF	24/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 22" N 32° 18' 5" E
					<i>Lentinus</i> sp.	KN 049 MF	02/ 11/ 20	0° 12' 10" N 32° 17' 40" E
			Omphalotaceae	<i>Neonothopanus</i>	<i>Neonothopanus hygrophanus</i>	KN 153 MF	21/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 42" E
				<i>Gymnopus</i>	<i>Gymnopus dryophilus</i>	KN 145 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 9" E
					<i>Gymnopus luxurians</i>	KN 103 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 34" N 32° 18' 7" E
					<i>Gymnopus ocior</i>	KN 114 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 6" E
					<i>Gymnopus biformis</i>	KN 092 MF	14/ 12/ 20	0° 12' 2" N 32° 17' 40" E
					<i>Gymnopus confluens</i>	KN 034 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 24" N 32° 18' 5" E
					<i>Gymnopus foetidus</i>	KN 033 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 27" N 32° 18' 5" E
			Hygrophoraceae	<i>Hygrocybe</i>	<i>Hygrocybe colemanniana</i>	KN 023 MF	19/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 7" E
					<i>Hygrocybe radiata</i>	KN 127 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 11" E

					<i>Hygrocybe</i> sp.	KN 058 MF	23/ 11/ 20	0° 12' 22" N 32° 17' 57" E
				<i>Lichenomphalia</i>	<i>Lichenomphalia umbellifera</i>	KN 038 MF	26/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 11" E
					<i>Lichenomphalia velutina</i>	KN 080 MF	07/12/ 20	0° 12' 33" N 32° 18' 12" E
				<i>Cuphophyllus</i>	<i>Cuphophyllus virgineus</i>	KN 117 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 6" E
			Dermolomataceae	<i>Cystoderma</i>	<i>Cystoderma amianthinum</i>	KN 016 MF	12/10/ 20	0° 12' 1" N 32° 17' 41" E
			Marasmiaceae	<i>Marasmius</i>	<i>Marasmius bekolacongoli</i>	KN 004 MF	05/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 23" N 32° 18' 11" E
					<i>Marasmius fulvoferrugineus</i>	KN 140 MF	14/ 05/20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 9" E
					<i>Marasmius tageticolor</i>	KN 170 MF	24/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 18" N 32° 17' 56" E
					<i>Marasmius spissus</i>	KN 129 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 29" N 32° 18' 11" E
					<i>Marasmius siccus</i>	KN 112 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 6" E
					<i>Marasmius rotula</i>	KN 118 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 6" E
					<i>Marasmius wynneae</i>	KN 007 MF	05/10/ 20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 10" E
					<i>Marasmius arborescens</i>	KN 079 MF	07/ 12/ 20	0° 12' 33" N 32° 18' 11" E
					<i>Marasmius</i> sp.	KN 194 MF	07/ 06/ 20	0° 12' 27" N 32° 18' 10" E
					<i>Lentinula</i>	<i>Lentinula edodes</i>	KN 139 MF	14/ 05/ 20

					<i>Collybia</i>	<i>Collybia alboflavoda</i>	KN 028 MF	19/ 10/20	0° 12' 25" N 32° 18' 5" E
						<i>Collybia subpruinosa</i>	KN 158 MF	21/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 11" N 32° 17' 42" E
						<i>Collybia cookei</i>	KN 162 MF	21/ 05/20	0° 12' 4" N 32° 17' 41" E
						<i>Collybia dryophila</i>	KN 047 MF	02/11/ 20	0° 12' 5" N 32° 17' 40" E
						<i>Collybia aurea</i>	KN 078 MF	07/12/ 20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 6" E
						<i>Collybia</i> sp.	KN 048 MF	02/11/20	0° 12' 6" N 32° 17' 40" E
					<i>Lactocollybia</i>	<i>Lactocollybia</i> sp.	KN 142 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 27" N 32° 18' 9" E
					<i>Tetrapyrgos</i>	<i>Tetrapyrgos nigripes</i>	KN 071 MF	30/11/ 20	0° 12' 26" N 32° 18' 5" E
						<i>Tetrapyrgos</i> sp.	KN 059 MF	23/11/ 20	0° 12' 22" N 32° 17' 57" E
					<i>Oudemansiella</i>	<i>Oudemansiella canarii</i>	KN 063 MF	23/11/ 20	0° 12' 19" N 32° 17' 54" E
				Mycenaceae	<i>Mycena</i>	<i>Mycena rapiolens</i>	KN 025 MF	19/ 10/20	0° 12' 31" N 32° 18' 5" E
						<i>Mycena cinerella</i>	KN 115 MF	07/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 30" N 32° 18' 6" E
						<i>Mycena vulgaris</i>	KN 019 MF	12/ 10/ 20	0° 12' 27" N 32° 18' 5" E
						<i>Mycena leptcephala</i>	KN 123 MF	14/ 05/ 20	0° 12' 32" N 32° 18' 11" E
1 Division	2 Classes	2 subclasses	9 orders	22 families	53 Genera	120 Species			

KN = Khady Ngom; MF = Mpanga Forest

Appendix2. Checklist of macrofungi species with an indication of their ecology, substrate, and seasonality

Species	Ecology	Substrate	First season	Second season
<i>Auricularia delicata</i> (Mont. ex Fr.) Henn	Saprobic	Wood	-	+
<i>Auricularia auricula-judae</i> (Bull.) Quél	Saprobic	Wood	-	+
<i>Tremalla fuciformis</i> Berk	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Polyporus grammacephalus</i> Berk	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Polyporus badius</i> (Pers.) Schwein	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Polyporus tenuiculus</i> (P. Beauv.) Fr	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Polyporus varius</i> (Pers.) Fr	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Neofavolus alveolaris</i> (DC.) Sotome & T. Hatt	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Daedaleopsis confragosa</i> (Bolton) J. Schröt	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Trametes gibbosa</i> (Pers.) Fr	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Microporus xanthopus</i> (Fr.) Kuntze	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Microporus affinis</i> (Blume & T. Nees) Kuntze	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Microporus vernicipes</i> (Berk.) Kuntze	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Hexagonia tenuis</i> (P. Beauv.) Fr	Saprobic	Wood	+	-
<i>Oligoporus ptychogaster</i> (F. Ludw.) Falck & O. Falck	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Ganoderma applanatum</i> (Pers.) Pat	Parasitic	Tree trunk	+	+
<i>Amauroderma rude</i> (Berk.) Torrend	Saprobic	Soil	+	-
<i>Amauroderma</i> sp.	Saprobic	Soil	+	-
<i>Amauroderma rugosum</i> (Blume & T. Nees) Torrend	Saprobic	Soil	+	-
<i>Cantharellus</i> sp.	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Rotten wood	+	-
<i>Agaricus arvensis</i> Schaeff	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Agaricus diminutivus</i> Peck	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Agaricus moelleri</i> Wasser	Saprobic	Litter	+	+

<i>Hymenagaricus</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Micropsalliota</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Amanita sinicoflava</i> Tulloss	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Coprinellus disseminatus</i> (Pers.) J.E. Lange	Saprobic	Litter	-	-
<i>Coprinellus</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Coprinopsis lagopus</i> (Fr.) Redhead	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Coprinopsis domesticus</i> (Bolton) Gray	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Coprinopsis cinerea</i> (Schaeff.) Redhead, Vilgalys & Moncalvo	Saprobic	Soil	+	+
<i>Parasola auricoma</i> (Pat.) Redhead, Vilgalys & Hopple	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella tephrophylla</i> (Romagn.) M.M. Moser	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella leucotephra</i> (Berk. & Broome) P.D. Orton	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella candolleana</i> (Fr.) Maire	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Psathyrella spadiceogrisea</i> (Schaeff.) Maire	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella clivensis</i> (Berk. & Broome) Rezende-Pinto	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Psathyrella inflatocystis</i> A.H. Sm	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Psathyrella conferta</i> Eyssart. & Chiaffi	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella pennata</i> (Fr.) A. Pearson & Dennis	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella conopilus</i> (Fr.) A. Pearson & Dennis	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Psathyrella olympiana</i> A.H. Sm	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Psathyrella</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Lepiota cristata</i> (Bolton) P. Kumm	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Lepiota felina</i> (Pers.) P. Karst	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Macrolepiota africana</i> (R. Heim) Heinem	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Macrolepiota procera</i> (Scop.) Singer	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Macrolepiota dolichaula</i> (Berk. & Broome) Pegler & R.W. Rayner	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Cystolepiota pulverulenta</i> (Huijsman) Vellinga	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Leucoagaricus rubrotinctus</i> (Peck) Singer	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Leucoagaricus croceovelutinus</i> (Bon & Boiffard) Bon	Saprobic	Litter	+	-
<i>Leucocoprinus scissus</i> Justo, Bizzi & Angelini	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Leucocoprinus brebissoni</i> (Godey) Locquin	Saprobic	Litter	+	+

<i>Volvariella volvacea</i> (Bull.) Singer	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Cortinarius humicola</i> (Quél.) Maire	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Inocybe sindonia</i> (Fr.) P. Karst	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Inocybe rimosa</i> (Bull.) P. Kumm	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Entoloma conferendum</i> (Britzelm.) Noordel	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Entoloma</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Claudopus variabilis</i> (Pers.) Gillet	Saprobic	Wood	-	+
<i>Rhodocybe</i> sp.	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Russula aurea</i> Pers	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Russula virescens</i> (Schaeff.) Fr.	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Lactarius chrysorrheus</i> Fr.	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	-
<i>Lactarius indigo</i> (Schwein.) Fr.	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Tricholoma stiparophyllum</i> (N. Lund) P. Karst	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Tricholoma</i> sp. 1	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Tricholoma</i> sp. 2	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i> (P.D. Orton) Redhead, Lutzoni, Moncalvo & Vilgalys	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Arrhenia epichysium</i> (Pers.) Redhead, Lutzoni, Moncalvo & Vilgalys	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Arrhenia obscurata</i> (D.A. Reid) Redhead, Lutzoni, Moncalvo & Vilgalys	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Clitocybe phaeoptalma</i> (Pers.) Kuyper	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Clitocybe fragrans</i> (With.) P. Kumm	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Clitocybe</i> sp. 1	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	-	+
<i>Clitocybe</i> sp. 2	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Panus fulvus</i> (Berk.) Pegler & R.W. Rayner	Saprobic	Wood	-	+
<i>Termitomyces robustus</i> (Beeli) R. Heim	Symbiont with termites	Termite mound	-	+
<i>Termitomyces microcarpus</i> (Berk. & Broome) R. Heim	Symbiont with termites	Termite mound	+	+
<i>Termitomyces clypeatus</i> R. Heim	Symbiont with termites	Termite mound	+	+
<i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> (Jacq.) P. Kumm	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Lentinus tigrinus</i> (Bull.) Fr	Saprobic	Soil	+	+
<i>Lentinus</i> sp.	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Neonothopanus hygrophanus</i> (Mont.) De Kesel & Degree	Saprobic	Wood	+	+

<i>Gymnopus dryophilus</i> (Bull.) Murrill	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Gymnopus luxurians</i> (Peck) Murrill	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Gymnopus ocior</i> (Pers.) Antonín & Noordel	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Gymnopus bififormis</i> (Peck) Halling	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Gymnopus confluens</i> (Pers.) Antonín, Halling & Noordel	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Gymnopus foetidus</i> (Sowerby) J.L. Mata & R.H. Petersen	Saprobic	Wood	-	+
<i>Hygrocybe colemanniana</i> (A. Bloxam) P.D. Orton & Watling	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Hygrocybe radiata</i> Arnolds	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Hygrocybe</i> sp.	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Lichenomphalia umbellifera</i> (L.) Redhead, Lutzoni, Moncalvo & Vilgalys	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Lichenomphalia velutina</i> (Quél.) Redhead, Lutzoni, Moncalvo & Vilgalys	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Cuphophyllus virgineus</i> (Wulfen) Kovalenko	Saprobic	Soil	-	+
<i>Cystoderma amianthinum</i> (Scop.) Fayod	Ectomycorrhizal symbiont	Soil	+	+
<i>Marasmius bekolacongoli</i> Beeli	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Marasmius fulvoferrugineus</i> Gilliam	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Marasmius tageticolor</i> Berk	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Marasmius spissus</i> Gilliam	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Marasmius siccus</i> (Schwein.) Fr.	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Marasmius rotula</i> (Scop.) Fr.	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Marasmius wynneae</i> Berk. & Broome	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Marasmius arborescens</i> (Henn.) Beeli	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Marasmius</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Lentinula edodes</i> (Berk.) Pegler	Saprobic	Soil	+	+
<i>Collybia alboflavoda</i> (Peck) Kauffman	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Collybia subpruinosa</i> (Murrill) Dennis	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Collybia cookei</i> (Bres.) J.D. Arnold	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Collybia dryophila</i> (Bull.) P. Kumm	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Collybia aurea</i> (Beeli) Pegler	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Collybia</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Lactocollybia</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	+	+

<i>Tetrapyrgos nigripes</i> (Fr.) E. Horak	Saprobic	Soil	+	+
<i>Tetrapyrgos</i> sp.	Saprobic	Litter	-	+
<i>Oudemansiella canarii</i> (Jungh.) Höhn	Saprobic	Wood	-	+
<i>Mycena rapiolens</i> J. Favre	Saprobic	Wood	+	+
<i>Mycena cinerella</i> (P. Karst.) P. Karst	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Mycena vulgaris</i> (Pers.) P. Kumm	Saprobic	Litter	+	+
<i>Mycena leptcephala</i> (Pers.) Gillet	Saprobic	Litter	+	+

Comment [AM38R37]: You don't need all these in journal publication. You may keep it for your future reference or as data for another research .

Appendix3. Correlation between the physical properties of the soil and the abundance of macrofungi species

		Ca	<i>Cuphophyllus virgineus</i>
Ca	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.998**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,002
	N	4	4
<i>Cuphophyllus virgineus</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.998**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	
	N	4	4
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Ca	<i>Tetrapyrgos nigripes</i>
Ca	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.962*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,038
	N	4	4
<i>Tetrapyrgos nigripes</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.962*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.038	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)			
		Ca	
Ca	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.983*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,017
	N	4	4
<i>Clitocybe fragrans</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.983*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.017	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Clay	<i>Termitomyces clypeatus</i>
Clay	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.986*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,014
	N	4	4
<i>Termitomyces clypeatus</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.986*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.014	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Clay	<i>Clitocybe phaeopectalpa</i>
Clay	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.986*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,014
	N	4	4
<i>Clitocybe phaeopectalpa</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.986*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.014	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		K	<i>Inocybe sindonia</i>
K	Pearson Correlation	1	0.953*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,047
	N	4	4
<i>Inocybe sindonia</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.953*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.047	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) N = Number of sites,			
		N	<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>
N	Pearson Correlation	1	0.994**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,006
	N	4	4
<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.994**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006	
	N	4	4

N		4	4
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Na	<i>Macrolepiota dolichaula</i>
Na	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.951*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,049
	N	4	4
<i>Macrolepiota dolichaula</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.951*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,049	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Na	<i>Arrhenia obscurata</i>
Na	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.995**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,005
	N	4	4
<i>Arrhenia obscurata</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.995**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,005	
	N	4	4
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Na	<i>Lentinus sp.</i>
Na	Pearson Correlation	1	0.986*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,014
	N	4	4
<i>Lentinus sp.</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.986*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,014	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Na	<i>Lactarius indigo</i>
Na	Pearson Correlation	1	0.988*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,012
	N	4	4
<i>Lactarius indigo</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.988*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,012	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Na	<i>Termitomyces microcarpus</i>
Na	Pearson Correlation	1	0.965*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,035
	N	4	4
<i>Termitomyces microcarpus</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.965*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,035	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		Na	<i>Hygrocybe colemanniana</i>
Na	Pearson Correlation	1	0.975*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,025
	N	4	4
<i>Hygrocybe colemanniana</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.975*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,025	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		OC	<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>
OC	Pearson Correlation	1	0.986*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,014
	N	4	4
<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.986*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,014	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		OM	<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>

OM	Pearson Correlation	1	0.986*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,014
	N	4	4
<i>Arrhenia velutipes</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.986*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.014	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
		P	<i>Rhodocybe</i> sp.
P	Pearson Correlation	1	0.976*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,024
	N	4	4
<i>Rhodocybe</i> sp.	Pearson Correlation	0.976*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.024	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
pH	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.953*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,047
	N	4	4
<i>Russula aurea</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.953*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.047	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			
			<i>Termitomyces clypeatus</i>
Sand	Pearson Correlation	1	0.986*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,014
	N	4	4
<i>Termitomyces clypeatus</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.986*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.014	
	N	4	4
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed), N = Number of sites			