

Dear author/authors;

Your study examining the effect of the two-spotted spider mite infection on cowpea on phyllosphere bacterial load is likely to make significant contributions to the literature. Your work is suitable for publication after the deficiencies/errors noted in the attached file are corrected. I hope that in your future work, you will investigate the infection of species that can alter the density and diversity of phyllosphere bacteria in a way that benefits plants.

Best regards.

Abstract

Line 22: The Oxford comma is used throughout the article. A similar method should be used throughout the manuscript.

Keywords

Lines 29-30: The words used in the title should not be used in the keywords. Additionally, the keywords should be listed in alphabetical order.

Introduction

The introduction is well written and summarizes the background of the topic.

Lines 61: The study cited as **Mendes et al., 2018** is not a study on *Arabidopsis thaliana*, contrary to what is mentioned in the sentence.

Materials & Methods

The Materials and Methods section is generally well written, with a few technical errors, and is detailed enough to allow for reproducibility of the study. Additionally, the meanings of HE, HA, UHE, and UHA must be specified in the material methods section. Additionally, this information should be included at the bottom of the relevant figures and tables.

Line 79: The first letters of the words must be capitalized.

Line 85: Need a gap between “0.5” and “g”.

Lines 93 and 97: Is the method belong to them? If not, please refer the original paper.

Lines 105 and 106: Is the method belong to them? If not, please refer the original paper.

Lines 109 and 118: In my opinion, the method and the reference Penton et al., 2016 seem to have no relevance. Please check.

Line 125: In my opinion, the method and the reference Grady et al., 2019 seem to have no relevance. Please check.

Line 133: In my opinion, the method and the reference Li et al., 2022 seem to have no relevance. Please check.

Line 135: Is the method belong to them? If not, please refer the original paper.

Results

The results section is generally well-written and summarizes the study's findings. Detected errors are listed below.

Line 161: The sentence must start with a capital letter

Lines 161-163: The sentence is not understandable. It should be rewritten to convey the intended meaning.

Line 169: The same word was used twice. It could be written as (...increased (92.21%).).

Lines 201 and 205: I think the word “infestation” should be “infection”.

Discussions

The discussion section of the study is generally well-written and effectively explores the topic within the literature. Detected shortcomings are listed below.

Line 254: The citation (Diaz-Cruz et al., 2022) is not in references section.

Lines 256-257: Although many studies were mentioned in the sentence, only one study was cited.

Lines 266-271: For better readability, the sentence can be changed as follows (...abundance of Proteobacteria (epiphytic),abundance of Firmicutes (epiphytic), ... abundance of Bacidiomycota (endophytic)).

Lines 276-277: Although many studies were mentioned in the sentence, only one study was cited.

Line 313: Need a gap after end of sentence.

Line 314: Need a dot after “..et al”.

References

Please use same type of reference writing rule. Among the references, there are examples of journal names written in full, as well as examples of shortened versions.

Line 341: Short journal name.

Lines 348 and 351: The references are written same in manuscript (Chen et al., 2020). You should add “a” and “b” after them. (Chen et al., 2020a and Chen et al., 2020b)

Line 358: Short journal name.

Line 361: Short journal name.

Line 364: Short journal name.

Line 367: Short journal name.

Line 370: Short journal name.

Line 380: Short journal name.

Line 383: Short journal name.

Line 386: Short journal name.

Line 407: First author surname not same in manuscript.