

## Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Elahi et al. studied Foliar Application of Gibberellin Alleviates Adverse Impacts of Drought Stress and Improvements Growth, Physiological and Biochemical Attributes of Canola (*Brassica napus* L.). The manuscript has a certain novelty, but the following problems need to be revised:

**Response:** Thanks for your appreciation. We have revised our manuscript as per the suggestions of the worthy reviewer

**Comment 1:** Check all abbreviations in the manuscript carefully to ensure their consistency.

**Response:** All abbreviations were checked and corrected

**Comment 2:** In line 88 of page 2, it is recommended to add the full name of the abbreviated form EC.

**Response:** Full name was added (Electrical conductivity (EC)).

**Comment 3:** This manuscript aims to explore the potential of gibberellic acid (GA<sub>3</sub>) in the alleviation of drought stress in canola. Three levels of GA<sub>3</sub> (G<sub>0</sub> = 0 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, G<sub>1</sub> = 100 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, and G<sub>2</sub> = 150 mg L<sup>-1</sup>) were applied to the leaves of two canola varieties (Punjab canola and Faisal canola) under two drought stress conditions (D<sub>1</sub> for three days of drought stress and D<sub>2</sub> for six days of drought stress). Although the amount of data is huge, the research contents and methods are slightly monotonous.

**Response:** Thanks for your comment. We have tried our level best to make the research contents and methods lively and clear.

**Comment 4:** The content of the conclusion part is very few, and some content can be added to enrich it.

**Response:** The conclusion section has been revised accordingly

**Comment 5:** Please carefully check whether the “Figure X” mentioned in the manuscript corresponds to the Figure X. As mentioned in lines 164-165 on page 5, “FC showed a decrease in NSPP that was 9.83 at 6D stress and with no application of GA (Figure 3).” The contents shown in Figure 3 do not mention the indicators of NSPP, while Figure 2 refers to this contents.

**Response:** Thanks for your comment. The figure number has been corrected accordingly

**Comment 6:** As shown in Figure 2, under 150 mg L<sup>-1</sup> of PC, the plant height (PH) value under treatment of 6D stress decreased compared with that under treatment of 3D stress. However, under the condition of 150 mg L<sup>-1</sup> FC, the plant height (PH) value under treatment of 3D stress was increased compared with the plant height (PH) value under treatment of 6D stress. Please give a reasonable explanation for this phenomenon.

**Response:** We have modified the statement by adding a reasonable explanation for this phenomenon (Please see lines 159-163)

**Comment 7:** The choice of keywords is not reasonable enough.

**Response:** We have revised the keywords as per the suggestion of the reviewer

**Comment 8:** Introduction is not attractive, so it is suggested that the author should improve it to some extent.

**Response:** We have revised the Introduction section as per the suggestion of the reviewer

**Comment 9:** The resolution of the picture in the manuscript is too low.

**Response:** We have improved the resolution of all the Figures as much as possible

**Comment 10:** The conclusions part is not profound and comprehensive enough.

**Response:** The conclusion section has been revised accordingly

**Comment 11:** The language of the manuscript needs great improvement.

**Response:** We have gone through the whole manuscript and corrected any typos and grammatical mistakes