

Dear Editor,

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript. Your feedback is greatly appreciated. We have revised our manuscript in agreement with your comments and the responses to these comments can be seen below. We hope that these revisions satisfy the journal's requirements and look forward to hearing about the outcome of our manuscript submission.

Kind regards,

Alexa-Kate Byers on behalf of the authorship team.

“Comments to the author:

I am happy with the revisions done by the authors. I have some minor comments.

Line 62, 125: 16S/ITS rRNA should be 16S rRNA/ITS. ITS is the spacer DNA situated between the small-subunit rRNA and large-subunit rRNA genes.

- **Response:** All instances where ‘ITS rRNA’ was used have been corrected to state just ‘ITS’.

I would suggest excluding the scientific name - (*Pinus radiata* D. Don.) - in the title but this is up to authors to decide.

- **Response:** ‘D. Don’ has been removed from the title in the revised manuscript.

Line 310: ‘significantly ___ than that’; missing word

- **Response:** Apologies, we have inserted the missing word and the sentence now reads “The average node degree and neighbourhood connectivity of the topsoil interkingdom networks was significantly **higher** than that of the subsoil networks.” Line 278 to 279.

Lot of repeated lines eg. line 43, line 306, line 390. Is this a formatting error?

- **Response:** these sections of the revised manuscript have been made more concise and avoid the use of repetitive language.

Please go through the entire manuscript carefully to spot grammatical and formatting errors. I did not read meticulously yet was able to spot some errors/inconsistencies.”

- **Response:** Apologies for the errors, we have gone through the entire manuscript and made grammatical corrections where required.