Review of: "Valorization of palm oil wastes into oyster mushrooms (Pleurotus HK-37) and biogas production"

Huaiwen Zhang[1]

1 Northwest A & F University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this manuscript, Aneth David and Anthony Manoni Mshandete investigate the co-production of oyster mushroom *Pleurotus* HK-37 and biogas as a means to add value to palm oil waste fractions. The manuscript is generally well written and easy to read, if not a bit wordy and in need of a little brushing up on the English. I have no major concerns with this paper, only minor comments, including:

1. In the abstract, when the abbreviation appears for the first time, the full name should be used first, followed by the abbreviation. For example, PMF, EFB, POME, SD, PPC, and PKS.

2. It is proposed to delete “African oil palm” and “Elaeis guineensis”, as well as to add “Biogas” as a keyword.

3. “substrate formulation (1:1 PMF:EFB supplemented with 20% PPC, 1% POME and 1% SD) for treated waste fractions (90.10%)”should be changed to “substrate formulation no. 7 (1:1 PMF:EFB supplemented with 20% PPC, 1% POME and 1% SD) for treated waste fractions (90.10%)”.

4. Are the data in the Tables and Figures represented as averages?

5. "For fresh substrate, the highest volume of biogas (1155 ml) was observed from

substrate formulation (1:1 PMF:EFB supplemented with 20% PPC, 1% POME and 1% SD)” should be changed to “For fresh substrate, the highest volume of biogas (1155 ml) was observed from substrate formulation no. 7 (1:1 PMF:EFB supplemented with 20% PPC, 1% POME and 1% SD)”.

6. "Methane volumepre-reated waste” should be changed to Methane volume pre-treated waste in Fig. 3.

7. The pre-treated waste fractions of no. 7 have the highest volatile solids content, but No.3 shows better mushroom yield and biological efficiency. Why is this the case?