For research article

Response to Reviewer 4 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?	Can be improved	
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: [Methodology.: I expected that the transcriptomic study was correlated with the phenotypic expression of the infection; by contrast I did not find any mention of disease severity in sodium silicate-treated and not treated potato plants].

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. The picture of infection phenotypic were be putted in supplementary Figure 1.

Comments 2: [References: According with the editorial style of the journal references in the text have to be cited with numbers in order of citation].

Response 2: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have followed editorial style of the *agronomy* references and adjusted citation style.

Comments 3: [Overall the quality and the subject of the study conform to the standard and the scope of the journal].

Response 3: Thanks for your affirmation of this manuscript. We will continue to work hard.

Comments 4: [English style: has to be improved (see text editings in the attached PDF file)].

Response 4: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have followed PDF file in attached to improve English style.

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.]