

This revised submission is, on the whole, successful. The authors have conscientiously addressed nearly all the comments raised by both reviewers, and the revised manuscript shows marked improvement in methodological transparency, depth of discussion, and overall presentation. In particular, the refinement of the Methods section (sampling design, soil analytical parameters, statistical methods) exceeds what is typically expected in a routine revision and reflects the authors' rigorous scholarly approach. Substantial progress has also been made in the Introduction's literature review, the mechanistic interpretation in the Discussion, and the technical corrections throughout. Based on the above evaluation, this reviewer considers that the revised manuscript essentially meets the journal's publication requirements. I recommend acceptance following completion of the priority revisions outlined above (Minor Revision). The authors' conscientious attitude and substantive improvements during the revision process are commendable.

1. Missing statistical information in Table 1

Issue Description: The table lists specific values for each soil physicochemical parameter but does not indicate whether these values represent a single measurement or the mean of multiple replicates, nor does it provide standard deviations or ranges of variation.

2. Inappropriate notation in the Figure 3 caption

Issue Description: Figure 3 presents an in vitro antagonism assay (plate confrontation) rather than a pot experiment. The "n = 3 pots" in the caption appears to have been copied and pasted from Figures 4/5.

3. Inconsistent significant digits in numerical values

Issue Description: In Table 3, the P solubilization values exhibit inconsistent decimal precision.

4. Recommendation: Add a "Study limitations" section

Add a brief "Study limitations" paragraph at the end of the Discussion or before the Conclusion that systematically lists the limitations of the present study and directions for future research. This would both demonstrate the authors' scholarly rigor and preemptively address potential queries from reviewers in subsequent rounds.