Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

**Point 1:** The authors look at the expression of IbTCP11/17 (targets of miR319) from lines 418-424. Here authors capture the early response to PEG compared to the drought response (water withdrawal) assessed earlier. To have a meaningful comparison, the authors need to show the expression level of these two genes in the drought assay (Lines 400-417). As the authors briefly mentioned, PEG stress is more severe than water withdrawal, so it will not give a solid verification provided there are two variables, inducer, and timing. In our experience, we observed completely different responses when we tried to compare PEG, air drying, and water withdrawal. This is essential given that no temporal expression baseline is established for IbTCP11/17 under water withdrawal stress and the presence of other regulatory mechanisms of IbTCP11/17.

**Response 1:** Thanks for your good suggestion and we have improved it.

**Point 2:** It is interesting to see that only MDA content increases in response to drought. The possible mechanism/reason should be included in the discussion.

**Response 2:** Thanks for your good suggestion and we have added the possible reason in the discussion.

**Point 3:** The discussion needs to be further expanded. Esp. RNA-Seq results need to be further discussed.

**Response 3:** Thank you for your positive and constructive suggestions and we have improved it in our revised manuscript.

**Point 4:** There should be a summary (concluding statement at the end). This manuscript ends very abruptly.

**Response 4:** Thanks for your good suggestions on this point. In our revised manuscript, we have made corresponding modifications to summary our work.