

Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	Reviewer's Evaluation	Response and Revisions
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Can be improved	
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Can be improved	
Is the research design appropriate?	Can be improved	
Are the methods adequately described?	Can be improved	
Are the results clearly presented?	Can be improved	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Can be improved	

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

Comments 1: Title: accepted as can get attention from reader.

Response 1: Agree. Thanks for your kindly comment.

Comments 2: Abstract: accepted. But please provide full scientific name for the first mention, If possible provide value for the mentioned parameters.

Response 2: Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. We agree with this comment. *We have followed the suggestion and provided full scientific name of genes alt, ela, lip, act, aerA, and fla in the abstract. Please see lines 29-31 in the revised manuscript.*

Comments 3: Introduction, may provide the importance of the mute swans (*Cygnus olor*) in ecological aspect in a paragraph.

Response 3: Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. We agree with this comment. *We have followed the suggestion and added the importance of the mute swans (*Cygnus olor*) in ecological aspect in a paragraph 3 in the Introduction. Please see lines 75-78 in the revised manuscript.*

Materials and methods

Comments 4: Provide ethical statement in the 2.1.

Response 4: Agree. Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. *We have followed the suggestion, and added the relevant reference in line 119 in the revised manuscript.*

Comments 5: any references for the method in the lines 105-110?

Response 5: Agree. Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. We have followed the suggestion and provided ethical statement in the 2.1. Please see lines 106-108 in the revised manuscript.

Comments 6: L 178-181: provide brand and country maker of the mentioned antibiotics.

Response 6: Agree. Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. We have followed the suggestion and provided brand and country maker of the mentioned antibiotics. Please see line 188 in the revised manuscript. Please see lines 186-191 in the revised manuscript.

Comments 7: Discussion-I think author is missing to discuss in detail the findings of antibiotic results.

Response 7: Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. We agree with this comment. We have followed the suggestion and supplemented discussion on the resistance of *A. veronii* HNZZ-1/2022. Please see lines 313, 326-328 in the revised manuscript.

Comments 8: Conclusion-Need to put more efforts by providing research gap and future work, furthermore, providing summary of each finding of the study will benefit the section.

Response 8: Thanks for your constructive and kindly suggestion. We agree with this comment. We have followed the suggestion and provided summary of each finding of the study, research gap, and future work in "5. Conclusions". Please see lines 356-363 in the revised manuscript.