

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	

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 explores the role of Naphthalene Acetic Acid (NAA) in improving the growth and yield of chilli (Capsicum annum L.), particularly in arid conditions. While the study provides useful data on the physiological responses of chilli to NAA application, a more in-depth discussion on the underlying biochemical mechanisms would enhance its scientific impact. Additionally, the economic analysis, though relevant, could benefit from a broader comparison with alternative growth regulators or agronomic practices. Overall, this research offers valuable practical insights, but a more comprehensive evaluation of its findings in the context of existing literature would strengthen its contribution to the scientific community.	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract is generally comprehensive but needs refinement for improved clarity, structure, and conciseness. Adding the research objective explicitly and restructuring the results for readability would enhance its scientific quality.	Noted
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<b>Potential Issues in Scientific Accuracy:</b> 1. <b>Lack of Statistical Analysis:</b> While the study presents numerical data, it does not mention any statistical tests (e.g., ANOVA, t-test) to confirm the significance of differences between the treatment and control groups. Without statistical validation, the reliability of observed differences remains uncertain. 2. <b>Experimental Design Details:</b> The manuscript does not clearly mention whether a proper experimental design (e.g., Randomized Block Design, replications) was followed. This is essential for ensuring unbiased results. 3. <b>Clarity in Treatment Application:</b> The methodology should explicitly mention how NAA was applied (e.g., number of sprays, growth stages, and intervals) to allow reproducibility.	Done as suggested
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	-	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	