

General comments

The manuscript entitled “First detection of herpesvirus and mycoplasma in free-ranging Hermann tortoises (*Testudo hermanni*), and in potential pet vectors” is a very interesting and complex study, that underlines the relevance of sanitary protocols in managing populations of testudos, both free-ranging or captive.

It is not easy in multidisciplinary studies like this to be understandable because various specialized languages must be used, yet there is a need for the message to reach several scientific fronts. For this reason, I believe that the manuscript can be improved to increase its scientific level and transversality. For example, I am interested in the diagnostic/microbiological aspects and I need more details on this part.

A general improvement of the English language may be appropriate using a professional service.

Another aspect is that, while I share the comments of the authors, many of these are not strictly related to the results, so they should be shortened widely.

Tables could be improved.

Specific comments

Line 41: “...are high AND should be SCREENED...”

Lines 51, 65: *sp.* is spp. (and not italic)

Line 94: correct in “sporadically”

Line 97: origins instead of provenances

Line 103: approximately instead of the symbol

In general, there is an overuse of words completely capitalized for with no reason (SOPTOM, VIRCON-Virkon, TERUMO NEOLUS, etc.).

Line 149: I suggest to clarify for non-expert “Each tortoise was measured by strait carapace length (SCL),...

Line 150: “nearest gram”

Line 151: “100 mm in SCL”

Line 166: et al. not in italic

Line 172: 1500 rpm FOR 5 min

Line 188: ...antibody responses by serum neutralization test (SN)...

Line 191: ...DNA of pathogens...

Line 195: the word TeHV already indicate herpesvirus; cut Herpesvirus.

Line 195: Origgi (one r)

Lines 196-197: the acronym PCR has been already introduced at line 188; the single acronym PCR is enough

Line 198:” ...detect active infection by *Mycoplasma* spp. and TeHV”

Line 207: the order of the references is correct? It is not in alphabetical or chronological order

For the results, the indication of the period in which the sampling was performed could be useful; some periods, like post-hibernation, is considered a period with immunodepression.

Line 210-212: you can short inserting 7 free-ranging WHT (6 adult females and 1 adult male) were...

Line 213: were positive for mycoplasma DNA

Line 217: nine or 9 in number (based on the guidelines of the journal)?

Line 226-227: tested positive for mycoplasma and negative for TeHV?

Line 227: Tortoise or tortoises?

Lines 233-234: SN and PCR positive could be due to reactivation, not recent infection.

The discussion, in general, are too comments poorly linked to the results.

Lines 236-240: on what results do the authors believe that pet animals are a risk for free-ranging? From the tables it appears that free-rangings are more positive than the others.

Table 2 and 3 could be merged and the introduction of the percentages for each group could be useful to understand and recognize the group. It is difficult to recognize in the text who are 18% and 40%.

Line 241: TeHV (capital letter for v)

Line 242: I lost the words after "in cages or in...."

Line 244: freeliving by various authors, is it appropriate a citation.

Line 258: cut e.g. in the list of references

Lines 274-286: to surely define the vagrants, genetic profile should be performed. In general, this paragraph is too long and not supported by solid results.

Line 317: TeHV (no HeHV)

Line 321: may promote virus reactivation from latent infection