

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Point 1: I would like to suggest authors label inoculation points in Figure 1, which could give readers a clear view of three different inoculation methods.

Response 1: Thanks! the inoculation points were labeled with the red arrows in Figure 1 as suggested.

Point 2: Line 142: “proportion of PPSD” should be “proportion of PSD or PPSD”.

Response 2: Sorry for carelessness. We corrected it as suggested. (Pag.4 Line 157)

Point 3: Line 143: “PPSD-premature spike death” should be “PPSD-proportion of premature spike death”.

Response 3: Thanks. We revised the expression in the footnote of Table 1. (Pag.4 Line 158)

Point 4: Lines 168 - 169: Should it be that DON content of most lines without *Fhb1* exceeded 1000 µg/kg under UBFi? Where is 4224.38 µg/kg in Table 1? Do you mean in Table S1?

Response 4: Thanks. we revised the sentence as “DON content of most lines without *Fhb1* exceeded 1000 µg·kg⁻¹ under UBFi method (Figure 2), with the highest reaching 4224.38 µg·kg⁻¹ (Table S1)”. (Pag.5 Line 184-186)

Point 5: Lines 411 & 413: “PPSB” should be “PPSD”.

Response 5: Thanks. We corrected it. (Pag.11 Line 441 & 443)

Point 6: Table S1: “PPSD - premature spike death” in the footnote should be “PPSD - proportion of premature spike death”.

Response 6: Thanks. We revised the expression in the footnote of Table S1.

Point 7: *Fhb1⁻* and *Fhb1⁺* don't appear in Table S1, so they can be removed from the footnote.

Response 7: Thanks. We revised the annotations in Table S1.