

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3392
Title of the Manuscript:	The quality of 'egusi' melon [(Citrullus lanatus Thunb.) Matsum and Nakai] seeds derived from fruits harvested at different growth stages and at different positions on the mother plant
Type of the Article	Book chapter

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This Book's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript will plays an impoartant part in seed production industry as it helps in improving seed yield and quality by taking suggestion from the results of the research	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable	
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.	No, I don't want any addition in abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections need improvement (changes recommended in general comments)	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is technically sound as it focus an important aspect of present day (seed production technology) Results helps other researchers to incorporate these findings to increase seed quality and yield in other crops	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No refrences are too old almost 22-24 years old references were used in introduction	

[Review Form 2](#)

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language must be checked by a native speaker	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">“Ojo <i>et al.</i> (2002) reported a seed yield in Nigeria ranging between 131 to 1005kg /ha”. It's 2024 and there must be huge different in seed yield in 2002 and 2024. Add recent yield data Methodology: Statistitical analysis is missing in methodology portion Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Under fruit age heading different parameters results were presented which creates confusion. Thus it is better to use subheadings for each parameter for better understanding Lot of spelling errors have observed in whole manuscript. Correct them Varieites/cu;tivar name must be start with capital letter	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayesha Manzoor
Department, University & Country	Barani Agricultural Research Institute, Pakistan