Response to Reviewer 2

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the reviewer for his constructive comments, which have significantly enhanced the manuscript. Authors respond to each comment (in the red font, pls see below) and have made tracked changes to the script.

The manuscript has become better. There are a number of problems that have been solved quite well. But there are also some problems that require further attention.

The problem of being unable to produce full statistical outputs (F values, etc.) due to the lack of access to initial data should be mentioned somewhere in the text of the manuscript as one of its limitations.

Ans. The inability to produce F value has been mentioned in the revised script at line 197-199.

Even though the authors mentioned that their analysis was based on co-occurrence and not on the ecology of viruses, there are some parts of the Discussion section where correlations seem to be exaggerated.

Ans. Authors tried to tone down the correlations in the Discussion section to address the concern. Please see lines 343, 398, 396, 428, 429, and 438.

The authors might want to tone down some phrases concerning the role of Arsenophonus since it has not been proved that the bacteria plays any role in virus transmission.

Ans. The role of Arsenophonus has been toned down in the revised script. Please see lines 388-393.

The explanation provided by the authors for the older sampling time frame is quite logical, yet, this information needs to be reflected in the manuscript.
Overall, I still recommend adding a limitations paragraph to the manuscript.

Ans. A paragraph has been added at the end of the discussion section. Please see lines 439-447.