

My response to the comments Ms n. 1714:

In response to the comments on the manuscript Ms n. 1714, below are my views:

1. With reference to the first comment from the reviewer, and from the relevant literatures we have cited, we write to point out some of the basic facts that *DefH9-iaaM* tomato plants are transgenic and lack commercial viability, even if fruit malformation were observed in few genetic background, then it is and evidence that has been confirmed based on our understanding on what we know on the *DefH9-iaaM* tomato transgenic. On the other hand, if not transgenic as pointed out by the reviewer, then it has nothing to do with intellectual property problems as indicated and its commercial viability would have been feasible.
2. In his second comments, our paper also pointed out how we can improve parthenocarpy via *DefH9-iaaM* transgene, it was not contradictory to other research work or finding that has been done in this area but focus on the alteration of promoter of a *DefH9-iaaM* transgene which probably can work within a range of expressivity of parthenocarpy versus “Pickelhauben” phenotype and G x E temperature dependence”, may as well be possible to achieve seedless fruit. Therefore, the idea is that through this mechanism, a balance can be reached in the production of seedless parthenocarpy fruits of good quality.
3. In the third comment, the reviewer highlights on the context of temperature as the major environmental variable affecting the expressivity of parthenocarpy. He conveyed the ideas of the authors in understandable manner.
4. The fourth comment by the reviewer was additional information provided which also formed the concluding part of the manuscript and the authors agreed with his comments.