

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_130608
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Naphthalene Acetic Acid (NAA) on Growth and Yield Attributing Characteristics of Chilli (Capsicum annum L.)
Type of the Article	Original type

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides critical insights into the role of Naphthalene Acetic Acid (NAA) in enhancing the growth, yield, and economic returns of chilli (Capsicum annum L.) under arid conditions. The findings contribute to the limited literature on the application of plant growth regulators in chilli cultivation, particularly under environmental stress. It underscores the significance of NAA in improving physiological traits, optimizing flowering, and reducing time to harvest, offering practical value for sustainable chilli production. This study holds implications for agronomic practices and future research on growth regulator applications in diverse agro-climatic zones.	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is suitable but can be more concise. Example “ Effect of Naphthalene Acetic Acid (NAA) on Growth and Yield Dynamics of Chilli (Capsicum annum L.)”	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The abstract clearly outlines the research objective, emphasizing the role of NAA in improving chilli growth and yield.Key results, including the increase in plant height, fruit yield, and economic benefits, are appropriately highlighted.</p> <p>Some improvements :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A focus on trends or percentage improvements would be more effective in this section.• Explicitly mention that the study was conducted under arid conditions to highlight its relevance to challenging agro-climatic zones.• Clarify the scope and methodology briefly (e.g., "conducted across 20 farms over two years").• Statistical significance, if calculated, is not mentioned and should be included	Noted
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. It adheres to the established methodology and includes appropriate statistical analysis. The results align with prior research on the role of Naphthalene Acetic Acid (NAA) as a plant growth regulator. The experimental design, including treatments, controls, and replications, is valid. Findings on growth, yield attributes, and economic analysis are consistent with cited literature. However, minor improvements in clarity, consistency in terminology, and detailed statistical validation (e.g., ANOVA or LSD values) could enhance the robustness of the conclusions.	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references listed are relevant and provide a good foundation for the manuscript. However, a significant portion of these citations is either older (e.g., studies from 2003, 2004, and 1966) or regionally specific, which may not fully capture recent global advancements in plant growth regulator research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add recent references: Incorporate studies published between 2020 and 2023 focusing on NAA and its effects on chilli or related crops to provide a broader and more current	Noted

Review Form 3

	<p>perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Broaden scope: Include references addressing advancements in experimental design or emerging plant growth regulator applications in horticulture.	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally understandable, but there are areas where it could be improved for scholarly communication. The text would benefit from more clarity, precision, and formal academic tone in several sections.</p> <p>Highlights</p> <p>1. Awkward Phrasing and Redundancy:</p> <p>Example: "The production of chilli is affected by several factors governed not only by the inherent genetic factors but also by several environmental factors and management practices." Suggestion: "Chilli production is influenced by both genetic and environmental factors, as well as management practices."</p> <p>2. Clarity in Scientific Description:</p> <p>Example: "The promoting effect on plant height by the application of NAA might be due to its action as a group of auxins." Suggestion: "The increase in plant height following NAA application is likely due to its auxin-like activity."</p> <p>3. Consistency in Terminology:</p> <p>Example: "The beneficial effect of growth promoters like NAA on physiological processes of plants leads to accumulation of carbohydrates and minerals in different parts of the plants and thus resulted in the production of a greater number of branches and leaves." Suggestion: "NAA promotes physiological processes that enhance carbohydrate and mineral accumulation, leading to increased branching and leaf production." There's a mix of tenses and phrasing that could be streamlined for readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	