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We want to thank you for providing excellent comment and suggestions on manuscript Ms. Ref. No.: **CROPRO-D-20-00707** entitled "EFFICACY OF FUNGICIDES AGAINST PEANUT SMUT IN ARGENTINA". Below we provide responses to all comments and questions made/raised by the reviewers, making changes to the manuscript where appropriate.

Editor's comments:

There are still many issues to be fixed, especially the English language and the use of appropriate and consistent terminologies throughout the manuscript, before the manuscript can be accepted for publication in the journal. Please log into the EES author's account of the journal where you can find attached my comments. Please note however that these comments are just some examples and that the manuscript needs a careful revision.

***Comment*** P1 Line 19-20: “what is leading to a local accumulation of *T. frezii* inoculum” rephrase

**Response:** The suggestion was accepted “ ” were incorporated. (Line 19-20)

***Comment*** P1 Line 20: Split this in two sentences or rephrase as the second part of the sentence is not well conntected to the first part. The use of ":" should be done in an appropriate manner.

**Response:** The suggestion was accepted, and the sentences were corrected.

***Comment*** P1 Line 20: “in vitro” Italic

**Response:** “in vitro” was replaced for italic through the entire manuscript (line 20; 73; 75; 274)

***Comment*** P1 Line 27: “pots experiments:” rephrase

**Response:**

***Comment*** P2 Line 31: technique to practice

**Response:** “technique” was replaced by “practice”

***Comment*** P2 Line 37: “is an annual extensive crop” rephrase

**Response:** The observation is appreciated, sentence was corrected “an important crop cultivated worldwide” were incorporated.

***Comment*** P3 Line 48: marked “pegging stage: the stage”

**Response:** The sentence was corrected

***Comment*** P3 Line 49: marked “an exudate that stimulate”

**Response:** The suggestion was accepted, the sentence was reformulated.

***Comment*** P3 Line 52: what this means? Susceptible? Moderately susceptible?

**Response:** The suggestion was accepted, and **“**highly susceptible” was incorporated

***Comment*** P4 Line 55: “but new genotypes are not expected to be adopted in the short term” why, mention

**Response:** The suggestion was accepted.To clarify, “However, for the industry characteristics (maintain the same cultivar in process) and growers production, new genotypes are not expected to be adopted in the short term” was incorporated

***Comment*** P4 Line 56: “Survival structure” what this means?

**Response: “**Smut spores” was incorporate to clarified

***Comment*** P4 Line 57-58: “an inefficient disease management technique” Crop rotation is a practice that helps reduce disease pressure but it is not a disease management technique per se

**Response:** Suggestionwas accepted, and the sentence was corrected. “inefficient practice in the current argentine production system to reduce disease pressure” was incorporated

***Comment*** P4 Line 69: marked “of fungicide sensitiveness of local *T. frezii* populations”

**Response:** Sentence was corrected

***Comment*** P4 Line 70: “chemical management strategy” please be consistent in using terminologies throughout the text: you use chemical control vs. chemical management; technique vs. strategy; efficacy vs. efficiency and so forth. The manuscript needs an in depth revision

**Response:** Thesuggestion was appreciated, the entire manuscript was revised. Terminologies were replaced according to the sentence. In addition, language was corrected in editing to ensure the manuscript was written in correct English, free of grammatical, spelling, and other common errors.

Authors thank suggestion made by the reviewers which significantly improve the quality of the manuscript.