

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_114261
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic analysis of yield traits in snake gourd (<i>Trichosanthes anguina</i> L.) genotypes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript provides valuable information about snake pumpkin (<i>Trichosanthes anguina</i>) in terms of its origin, distribution, nutritional composition, medicinal importance, production challenges, and the need for genetic improvement.</p> <p>2. Yes, it clearly states the focus of the research.</p> <p>3. The summary presents a concise overview. However, it would be helpful to add a final sentence to conclude the summary more clearly.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is well structured.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript follows a proper scientific approach.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references provided cover a wide range of aspects related to snake gourd and related crops.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The text is well written, suitable for the scientific context, with few grammatical or syntax errors. However, some sentences could be restructured to improve fluidity and clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article addresses a topic that has a genuine contribution to socioeconomic issues, and it is commendable to see this type of discussion being initiated. In India, where there is a high rate of malnutrition, food plays a crucial role in promoting the health and well-being of the population.</p> <p>However, when reading the article, I noticed that the conclusion is not appropriate, and could be more specific regarding the results obtained in the research, considering that part of the current text should be in the results and discussion topic, or in final considerations. It was observed that there is no comment on the differences between the varieties and there was a lack of discrimination about them and the productivity factor of each variety.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cassia Rejane do Nascimento
Department, University & Country	UFRR – Federal University of Roraima, Brasil