For review article

Response to Reviewer 4 Comments

1. Summary

We are grateful for your helpful comments, and hope our revision addresses them well. According to the reviewers' comments, we have made major modifications to our manuscript as follows: As the description of five viral isolates in section 2 duplicated Table 1 which was comprehensive, we removed the description of five viral isolates in section 2 and improved the Table 1; Lines 373-391 – the entire paragraph about isolates' sequence similarity and conversation were moved up to section 2 which introduced the viral genome structure including viral sequences; Lines 322-391 – a huge paragraph with an unclear thesis was shortened and reorganized to focus on virus-host interaction; The section 7 have been rewritten and condensed to discuss the future research directions and strategies, and added a figure to display them. To improve writing, we asked the TopEdit LLC for the linguistic editing and proofreading this manuscript. In this revised version, changes to the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments were all highlighted, and the parts modified by the polishing agency were shown in red font.

Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions highlighted changes in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Is the work a significant contribution to the field?	★★★☆☆	
Is the work well organized and comprehensively described?	★★★☆☆	
Is the work scientifically sound and not misleading?	★★★☆☆	
Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work?	★★★☆☆	
Is the English used correct and readable?	★★★☆☆	

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: In a table, genera should be written as one word (e.g. alphachrysovirus, betachrysovirus).

Response 1: Thanks for your pointing out the problem. We corrected in Table 1 in page 4.

Comments 2: The manuscript needs more detailed introduction of viruses including reorganising some chapters. For example, lines 373-391 – the entire paragraph about sequence differencies belongs to the beginning to introduce viruses of interest.

Response 2: We are grateful for your suggestion. Based on the amino acid sequences of the RdRp and P3 proteins (≤ 53 % amino acid sequence identity in the RdRp and P3), we proposed FgV-ch9 and FgV2 were different isolates of a single chrysovirus and FsCV1 and FodV1 were different isolates of another chrysovirus. It was speculated that isolates might have similar impacts on host and should be compared for studies on virus-host interaction, which was our main idea and the reason to arrange this content in section 7. However, considering adjusting this part to section 1 might not help to show our idea, Lines 373-391 – the entire paragraph about isolates' sequence similarity and conversation were revised and moved up to section 2 which introduced the viral genome structure including viral sequences (in line 119-144 in revised version).

Comments 3: lines 59-60: The virus isolates belonging to the Chrysoviridae family are small, isometric, non-enveloped particles: use either „virus isolates HAVE small....particles“ or „the viruses belonging to the....“ (without „isolates“)

Response 3: Sorry for our poor writing. We modified in line 66-68.

Comments 4: line 65: main capsid protein (CP; P2 or P3) - explain the „P2 or P3“

Response 4: Thanks for your question. In the viruses, belonged to genus *Alphachrysovirus*, with three dsRNA segments, the protein P2 encoded by dsRNA2 as the protein CP; while in other chrysoviruses with four or more dsRNA segments, most of them are the protein P3 encoded by dsRNA3 as the protein CP. And we modified this content in line 73-74.

Comments 5: lines 73-80: sentences need better structure and connection as they are logical continuations

Response 5: Sorry for our poor writing and many thanks for your suggestion. We modified this paragraph to focus on the hypovirulence inducing chrysoviruses in *Fusarium* in line 79-101.

Comments 6: line 99: chrysovirus reported to BE isolated from

Response 6: Sorry for our poor writing. We modified in line 108.

Comments 7: lines 114-117: you cannot write that the genome contains incomplete RNAs. They are simply not fully sequenced.

Response 7: Sorry for our careless writing. As the description of five viral isolates in section 2 duplicated Table 1 which was comprehensive, we removed the description of five viral isolates in section 2 (line 110-149 in previous version) and improved the Table 1 in the revised version.

Comments 8: line 137: genu - genus

Response 8: Sorry for our careless writing. We removed the description of five viral isolates in section 2 (line 110-149 in previous version) as needed.

Comments 9: line 187: lever - level?

Response 9: Sorry for our careless writing. We corrected in line 227.

Comments 10: lines 239-242 belongs more to Conclusion

Response 10: Sorry for our poor writing and many thanks for your suggestion. We modified this in line 295-296 as needed.

Comments 11: lines 290-291: „few research on they also could be transmitted“ does not make sense

Response 11: Sorry for our poor writing. We modified in line 350-351 as needed.

Comments 12: line 316: chrysoviurses - chrysoviruses

Response 12: Sorry for our careless writing. We corrected throughout this paragraph in line

379-383.

Comments 12: line 328: „...strain cannot either answer this question. The „either“ belongs at the end of the sentence

Response 12: Sorry for our poor writing, and we deleted redundant parts in line 323-336 in previous version and shortened to focus on clarify the key factors in chrysoviral accumulation in line 411-413 in revised version.

Comments 14: line 358: above fore ?

Response 14: Sorry for our careless writing. We corrected in line 119 in which was moved up to section 2 which introduced the viral genome structure including viral sequences.

Comments 15: lines 434-435 Funding: "please add" doesn't seem to belong here.

Response 15: Sorry for our careless writing and many thanks for your suggestion. We deleted.

Comments 16: lines 436-445 Institutional Review Board Statement: the whole paragraph doesn't belong here.

Response 16: Many thanks for your suggestion. We modified as needed.