# For research article

# Response to Reviewer 8 Comments

**1. Summary**

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions in the re-submitted files.

| **2. Questions for General Evaluation** | **Reviewer's Evaluation** | **Response and Revisions** |
|---|---|---|
| Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references? | Yes | *[Please give your response if necessary. Or you can also give your corresponding response in the point-by-point response letter. The same as below]* |
| Are all the cited references relevant to the research? | Yes | |
| Is the research design appropriate? | Yes | |
| Are the methods adequately described? | Yes | |
| Are the results clearly presented? | Yes | |
| Are the conclusions supported by the results? | Yes | |

**3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors**

**Comments 1:** [Line 277-277 'These genes were randomly chosen for the validation analysis. These gens were randomly chosen for the validation analysis.' Sentence repetitions should be edited].

**Response 1**: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Because of my negligence, "These genes were randomly chosen for the validation analysis." were mentioned twice in this paragraph, Therefore, we have removed line 277 to reduce redundancies.

**Comments 2:** [Statistical differences between hours should be shown in Figure 1].

**Response 2**: Because *Rhizoctonia solani* will show symptoms on the 8 days post infection, we didn't shown the differences expression genes between hours.

**Comments 3:** [The effect of sodium silicate on preventing *Rhizoctonia solani* AG-3 in potatoes should be given].

**Response 3**: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. The effect of sodium silicate on preventing *Rhizoctonia solani* AG-3 in potatoes were shown in supplementary Figure 1. In addition, our laboratory's previous results have shown that sodium silicate deficiency can enhance the resistance of potatoes to *Rhizoctonia solani* AG-3, and we cited this reference in line 86-88.

**Comments 4:** [Line 406-407 No reference is given for the inoculation method; it should be added. *Rhizoctonia solani* does not produce spores. How was a homogeneous measurement made? It is not understood].

**Response 4**: Thank you for pointing this out. *Rhizoctonia solani* does not produce spores, we used mycelium to infection. We didn't consider it carefully, but the mycelium were grinded fine as possible as and the error was relatively small.

**Comments 5:** [Defining the effect of sodium silicate against stem canker infection in potatoes on genes related to resistance in the plant and detecting changes in important genes made the study original].

**Response 5**: Thanks for your affirmation of this manuscript. We will continue to work hard.

**Comments 6:** [This manuscript is written in acceptable good English].

**Response 6**: Thanks for your affirmation of this manuscript. We will continue to work hard.

**Comments 7:** [Significant gene differences tested should be mentioned in the abstract].

**Response 7**: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. DEGs and pathways have mentioned in the abstract in line 19-22.

**Comments 8:** [My general opinion is that the article is of a quality that can be published after minor revision. I also believe that it will receive citations as studies in this field increase].

**Response 8**: Thanks for your affirmation of this manuscript. We will continue to work hard.

**4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language**

**Point 1:**

**Response 1:** (in red)

**5. Additional clarifications**

*[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]*