

Editorial comments:

In my earlier review I suggested that "I was not convinced about the statistical method used. Two factors namely treatments and the days after inoculation. Therefore, a two-way ANOVA would be more appropriate than the one-way ANOVA (???). This would provide more information on the variation among treatments, days after inoculation and their interactions. Still you have presented the mean separations? Provide the F value and the level of significance for each variable".

The reply of the authors was as follows:

The probabilities ($P < 0.05$) mentioned under the tables showed existence of significant differences among means in the main effects and their interactions. Therefore since the Post hoc has been done and significant differences were shown by assigning letters, we thought it unnecessary and statistically unacceptable to put the Prob. values there. In addition, you have highlighted tables 2 and 3 for us to check and to avoid confusion we decided to remove the Prob. Values.

The purpose of providing the F-value is to make the reader understand the results of the statistics more easily. For example, reading tables 2 and 3 is rather difficult as the reader has to compare all the values presented in the tables (see table 4). Normally, mean separations should be read either across a column or row. not across the entire table as presented. Therefore, present the F values for treatments, days and their interactions below each variable. **Further, present mean separations in standard format either for a column or row and not both.**

Remove the CV's

The tables would be more easy to read if changes were made as mentioned above.

Author's feedback:

The mean separation was done for each column and not for the entire table. In addition, the CV was removed from each table and replaced with F-value for the main effects and their interaction.