

Editor's Comment:

In this revision, the authors have taken the reviewers' suggestions into account and revised the manuscript. However, after reading the revised version, I believe that the work requires significant revisions before it can be considered for publication. I have noted most of my comments in the annotated manuscript. Further these are my major comments.

- The presentations need significant improvement. There are many instances of joined words that make reading difficult. Additionally, abbreviations are not explained upon their first mention, and there are issues with sentence structure as well as incomplete sentences throughout.
- Please refer author's instructions for citing references in the text. Different styles of citing references are evident in the revised version.
- Please refer to the author's instructions for citing references in the text. Different styles of citing references are evident in the revised version.
- Check and correct the pathogen name. *Phaeoisariopsis personata* (Berk. & M.A. Curtis) Arx, is a synonym of *Mycosphaerella berkeleyi* W.A. Jenkins. Similarly, correct the family and subfamily of groundnut.
- Revise the methods by providing additional details like the source of seeds, interplant distance, number of plants per plot, cultural practices (irrigation, weeding, fertilizer application, etc.), climatic conditions during the experimental period, harvest, and measurement of yield parameters. Provide a detailed description of the statistical methods used to assess significance in the methods section.
- The field experiment was conducted over three Kharif seasons from 2021 to 2023. It would be valuable to analyze whether the differences in disease incidence and yield varied from year to year.
- The data should be analyzed using a multiple comparison test, considering both years and treatments as the main factors. Furthermore, the results of the statistical analysis should be presented in tables and figures. These tables and figures must be self-explanatory; therefore, it is important to include explanations for all abbreviations and treatments in the footnotes or legends.
- The discussion section lacks focus and appears overly reminiscent of a literature review. Instead, it should compare how the results of the current study align or contrast with

previous studies, providing reasons for any discrepancies.

Include potential future considerations and additional work required to advance this study.

Present the individual yield parameters as separate graphs instead of grouping them.

Further, add error bars and results of statistical analysis in the figures.

Table 1: Provide the values for all three years instead of providing pooled data. Present the results of the statistical analysis in the table.

Editor's Details:

Prof. T. Muthukumar
Bharathiar University, India.