

General comments

The manuscript entitled “First detection of herpesvirus and frequency of mycoplasma infection in free-ranging Hermann tortoises (*Testudo hermanni*), and in potential pet vectors” has been improved.

It is very informative; however, some limitations are still present, especially reading from a specialist point of view, in which technical details are required. Relevant data is there but the technical language is not always appropriate. It is difficult to write a multidisciplinary manuscript because each language generally has very technical aspects.

There is no statistical analysis that compares the frequencies of the groups. However, the data allows any readers to calculate these differences.

The authors should uniform the capital letters or not when writing the name of the etiological agents.

Perhaps it should be clarified in the introduction that infection is not the same as disease and that respiratory forms can also be triggered by other etiological agents while here only two of these, probably the main ones, are evaluated.

Specific comments

Line 2: “frequency of mycoplasma infection...” generally is prevalence of infection.

Line 34-35: it is important to identify the test to diagnose an infectious disease: “by PCR” in these sentences. On the contrary the samples were negative for TeHV by SN.

Line 42: “screened” instead of “scrutinized”.

Line 62: “on agents of URTD” is better than “on URTD” because the study investigated some etiological agents of URTD, not only the disease. In this perspective, statistical analysis would be useful.

Line 71: here Herpesvirus could be written without capital letter because it is written as normal word and not in Latin for taxonomy.

Line 182: “et al.” not in italics.

Line 203: TeHV type 1 and 3, not serotypes.

Lines 207-219: the reference of Soares et al., 2004 for the protocols of PCR is correct, but he used protocols previous published in other studies; please, also indicate these protocols to facilitate the rapid identification of the protocol to the reader. This is relevant to compare sensitivity and specificity of different tests.

Lines 220-221: data of the Table 2 is pertinent of results. It should be moved at the beginning of the results.

Lines 235-244: in my opinion this part is more readable by the table 2 and the text could be cut.

At the end of the results a statistical comparison among groups would have been useful to identify risk or protective, or not relevant factors.

Line 257: why contamination and not infection?

Line 272: contamination or transmission?

Line 333: I suggest full stop and newline with the word "Further...".

Line 365: spectrum, range, instead of spectre.

Line 385: URTD, insert the T.

Line 606 and 614: Results in capital letters at the beginning of the caption of the tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 and 3: the symbol "+" could be misinterpreted. I suggest to write "positive results""positive test" or similar.