Comments and suggestions by Reviewers and Actions by authors

Reviewer 1

This study primarily focuses on the isolation, identification, and assessment of a new nematode-trapping fungus (NFT) from decaying wood in Morelos State, Mexico. The fungus, named Arthrobotrys mendozadegivensis, exhibited a predatory activity of 76.92%, and its liquid culture filtrates were effective in killing Haemonchus contortus larvae. The study is highly significant, and the author's work in isolation and identification is thorough. However, it appears that many of the results have been included in the discussion section, which may cause confusion for readers. The results section should objectively present the research findings while the discussion section is meant for interpreting those findings and comparing them to previous studies. It is suggested that the author review both sections and make appropriate revisions.

My specific comments are focused on minor technical mistakes and I do not have any bad criticism about the design or structure of the study.

--Line 42: even the Antarctic [9].

Authors: The dot was moved after brackets.

--Line 99-100: A suggestion: In describing the process of fungal cultivation, it can be emphasized that sterile operations are used and that the water added to the bottom of the Petri dish was sterile water.

Authors: In the section about Fungal Isolation we state that the whole procedure was performed under sterile conditions (Lines 90-96). We have also inserted the term “sterile” when we refer to water used to prepare the humid chamber (line 104).

--Line 172: why you inoculated the isolate under dark conditions?

Authors: We ´re sorry! We certainly did not use dark conditions! This was written by mistake. We deleted this big error!

--Line 190: How many parallel groups did you conduct in your experiment? How many experiments were repeated in total?

Authors: We actually used two groups one control (without fungus) and other treated (With fungus). Each experiment considered 4 plates (n=4); The entire experiment was performed in triplicate, giving a total of 12 plates per group.

--Line 228: Was there a parallel group set up during the experiment, or was it just one set of experiments repeated three times?
Author: We conducted three experiments using 4 plates for each group.

--Line 232: the 'p' needs to be italicized. Please read the full text, all p-values indicating statistical significance need to be italicized.
Authors: The letter “p” was italized.

--Line 242: change “name” to “named”.
Authors: this term was corrected

--Line 373: The content of Table 3 seems more suitable to be included in the results, as it is evidence that you have identified the isolated fungi as newly discovered fungi.
Authors: We agree with your comment!
We have moved Table 3 to the Results section

--Line 381-382: The part describing the results of Table 3 seems more suitable to be included in the results.
Authors: IDEM

--Line 387: the predatory activity you showed in section 3.3 was 76.92%.
Authors: We corrected the predation percentage in the Discussion section.

--Line 395: Why is section 3.4 after section 4? The sub-heading of section 3.4 is repeated from the previous section 3.4.

Authors: Sorry! Big mistake! We have corrected this sequential number.

--Line 398-400: This sentence and Table 4 seem more suitable to be placed in the Results section, as you used the data from Table 4 in Section 3.3.

Authors: We believe that Table 4, which illustrates the predatory activity of other fungal species as reported by various authors for comparison, should remain in the Discussion section. However, if you feel that it would be more appropriate to move it to the Results section, we are open to making that change.