

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article deals with a study of the physical and chemical induction of mutagenesis of the strain of the Auricularia species native to southern Nigeria, the seeds obtained were tested with sawdust substrate supplemented with calcium carbonate and rice bran to produce fruiting bodies obtaining biological efficiencies of both the wild and the mutant of 197 % and 90 %, respectively. The spawning rate was negatively affected by mutagenesis in mutant strains. It is suggested to carry out more tests to check the mutagenesis and its effects, as well as a rigorous discussion of the results adhering to the biological and biochemical foundations of the species studied. 2. The title shows the contribution of the research, so it is appropriate. 3. The summary contemplates the methodology used as well as the main results and their application. 4. The subsections and the distribution of the manuscript are adequate. 5. The manuscript is considered to develop the scientific method. 6. The references can increase to 30, only it must be updated since there are only 12% of recent references and 88% of references that are more than five years old. 7. In the introduction it is necessary to highlight the contents of protein, lipids, carbohydrates, water, minerals, to specify their nutritional contribution and emphasize their importance of consumption and production. 8. In the last line of the investigation, mention should be made of the object of the investigation. 9. In the methodology part, it should be more specific to write the place where the samples are collected since it gives general information. In the case of the identification of the strains, standardized techniques must be used to support what was described by the expert Professor Omon. 10. In the results section, the identification stages must be included under established and rigorous criteria to scientifically support the species found during the isolation. Likewise, it is recommended to incorporate the data of the strains identified as contaminants, which is very common to find when isolating wild strains. 11. There is no rigorous analysis of the results, since it does not explain biochemically where the species of the fungus that induce the decrease in micellar growth and the fruiting body itself are being affected. It is suggested to carry out an exhaustive search to be able to further argue the effect of mutagenesis on this species. 12. The exposed graphs can be improved in bar graph and must include a reproducible work through the statistical analysis that it lacks. 13. The results section does not describe the effect of the different substrates, as well as their nutritional contribution and induction for the different stages of development of the strain, it is recommended to use these arguments to make a better discussion of the results. Of the physical and chemical treatments, the biochemical effect on mutagenesis is not mentioned, it is important to be able to describe it. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A grammar check is recommended in the written article.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The object of the investigation is not specified, so it is essential that it be included.2. In the results an adequate discussion is not demonstrated, likewise the study is incomplete since the purpose that is sought when performing the mutation in the species and specifically what are the biochemical modifications is not understood.3. The conclusions do not demonstrate the importance of the investigation.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Belem Arce Vazquez
Department, University & Country	Tecnológico Nacional de México, Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Ecatepec, México