Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Dear Reviewer,

We thank you for your time and constructive comments, which have helped us improve the quality of our manuscript. We have carefully considered each of your suggestions and made the necessary revisions to improve the quality of our paper. We believe that these changes have significantly enhanced the overall clarity and robustness of our results.
We address each comment separately in the following detailed response. The original comments are bolded with our response found underneath it.
Sincerely,

The Authors

Point-by-point response to Comments

Comment 1: The abstract needs to be improved. While more focus has been given to DL part, a better intro and implications are also needed in the abstract which needs to be added.

Response 1: We have modified the abstract to highlight the relevance to phenotyping, efficient crop management, and the selection of drought-resilient varieties.

Comment 2: Some more details about the baseline methods needs to be provided.

Response 2: We have provided more details about our baseline models in section 3.1. Table 2 in section 3.3 also showed a comparison between model architecture and performance.

Comment 3: I would suggest to make the code base and data available online to that this study can be reproduced. If the authors does not have permissions to share the data, code will be fine. This will allow other researchers to reproduce these methods for other crops and other diseases.

Response 3: Both the dataset and the code have been made publicly available and can be accessed at the links included in the Data Availability Statement Section.