Reviewer 2

The article presents the results of a two-year monitoring of the spread of pathogens that cause soft rot in potatoes. The article has a lot of practical applications.

Thank you for your positive remark

I have a few technical remarks.

1. What differences are taken into account significant at p=0.05 or p=0.01?

We added the significance level (P=0.05) in the Material & Methods section (2.12 Statistics).

2. It is required to display the standard deviations and noteworthy differences in Figures 1, 2, 3, and S3.

In figure 1, results of a survey are shown in which 100 (2019) or 200 (2020) plants were randomly sampled along spraying paths in the field, after which the percentage of infection was calculated. We could consider to calculate pairwise differences between years, but the differences are so obvious, that statistics are useless. We have no repetitions within a field and therefore no standard deviations can be added.

The same counts for figure 2, in which just the percentage of samples infected with vPbr were calculated. We have no repeats, and standard deviations cannot be calculated.

For unknown reasons, information on pairwise differences present in the original Figure 3 was lost. We replaced it by a new one, showing the statistics (pairwise differences) between strains.

In Figure S3, data of individual samples are shown to indicate that for *P. parmentieri* Ct-values were high and for *Dickeya* three samples with relatively low Ct-values were found. For individual data no standard deviations can be calculated.

3. The Figure 3 is referred to as figure 6 in the archive.

Unfortunately, we did not understand this comment. Please explain.

4. Figure 2 is not understandable. This information should be presented in a clearer manner.

We rearranged the data and also revised the legend. We hope that the revised figure is clearer.

5. Figures are not put in the text according to their initial citation sequence. Information is hard to comprehend when you have to seek for the appropriate graph for a long time.

We corrected the position of the figures in the manuscript.

6. Figure 1S's title indicates to Dickeya sp., and the image itself indicates Dickeya solani.

Unfortunately, we did not understand this comment. Please explain.

7. Probably, index 4 in table S3 refers to the ND value in row 11.

Corrected

8. The colors used in Figure 1 in Survey 2020 for Dickeya sp. to represent leaves, stems, and tubers are different from those used in the other graphs.

We changed the colors of figure 2 and 3 to harmonize the lay-out of the graphs

9. You should check the links. The seventh link is lacking the journal's title.

We completed the information