Pointwise answers to reviewer's comments

Moderate editing of English language required: English language and style are needful done as highlighted and minor spell check is also needful done.

S.No	**Comment**	**Reply**
	Reviewer #2:	
1	Line 19: Scientific names should be in italic (*Lagenaria siceraria*) and also all scientific names throughout the manuscript.	Needful done. Kindly refer to line no. 43,62.
2	Line 30: "F4 crossing period" "F4" should be replaced by "CP4". The same abbreviations should be unified throughout the manuscripts.	Replaced the word in the text. Kindly refer to line no. 56.
3	The introduction needs major improvement. Lines 50-60 should be presented earlier at the beginning of the introduction. The other paragraphs need to be rearranged to present the introduction of studied topic smoothly. The knowledge gap, rationale, and objectives need more clarification.	The introduction section is rewritten keeping in mind more clarification about the objectives. Kindly refer to line no. 67-179.
4	The materials and methods section needs to be carefully revised and improved.	Carefully revised the materials and methods. Kindly refer to line no. 182-342.
5	Line 116: "The flowers (male and female) were emasculated" how did you collect pollen from emasculated male flowers.	At the start of the crossing period in hybrid and parental lines seed production, the male flower was chosen in the parental lines and bagged with paper bags in the previous evening and pinched off in the next morning and kept carefully in a glass container. After bagging, waited for one week and observed female flower ovary growth. The increased size of the ovary confirmed the successful crossing after that it was tagged using different color threads as shown in the picture. Kindly refer to line no. 209-232.
6	The growing conditions of parental lines and agricultural practices should be presented.	Added the text. Kindly refer to line no. 87-190, 203-2081.
7	The results section is poorly written, more efforts are needed to present the text in better status. The difference among assessed crossing periods needs more clarification in all evaluated parameters.	The results are revised and rectified the sentences. Kindly refer to line no. 343-684.
8	The significance letters are wrongly presented with non-corresponding values. For example in Table 4 in the column of kharif for moisture %, the highest value of the crossing period is 14.3 followed by 12.4, 10.2, 9.4, 8.6. So, they should be accompanied by a, b, c, d and e in the same order. But, the values are presented as 12.4 a, 10.2 b, 14.3 c, 9.4 d and 8.6 e. The same statistical mistake is in the other columns.	The statistical mistake has been rectified as suggested in Table 4. Kindly refer to line no. 397.

9	In some columns in Table 4, the authors ordered the significance letters from highest to lowest values. While in other columns the authors did the opposite and ordered the significance letters from lowest to highest as Crude fiber, 20.3 a, 26.6 b, 31.2 c, 38.5 d and 48.3 e. Also in Table 5 kharif (31.7°C) of TSS (°Brix), the averages were ordered as 4.7 a, 5.6 b, 6.4 c, 7.4 d, and 8.2 e. But in other columns as kharif (31.7°C) of crude protein ordered from the highest to the lowest 19.1 a, 15.3 b, 14.2 c, 13.3 d, 12.7 e. The presentation of obtained data should be unified throughout the manuscript.	The data has been rectified in all tables.
10	There are no significance letters in Table 7 and 11	Significant letters have been added in Table 7 and 11. Kindly refer to line no. 505 and 515.
11	Table 9 is poorly presented, it could be divided into separate tables and improved.	Corrected the Table 9. Kindly refer to line no. 575 and 585.
12	The association among evaluated characteristics and assessed crossing periods could be presented better in a biplot of principal components and heatmap with clustering.	Added the biplot. Kindly refer to line no. 647.
13	More details are needed in the caption for uppercase and lowercase letters in Figure 3.	Added the caption. Kindly refer to line no. 676-683.
14	The results are poorly discussed, the discussion should be separated and improved.	Discussion is improved and separated from results. Kindly refer to line no. 343-683 and 684-813.
15	Line 549 “TRITICUM DURUM” is written a wrong way, it should be “*Triticum durum*”. Al scientific names in the text and reference list should be revised.	Corrected the name as suggested. Kindly refer to line no. 1082.
16	Line 563 “International Journal of Agricultural Sciences” The journal in complete name while the others are abbreviated. The reference style should be carefully revised and unified according to Plants style.	The reference style has been updated as per the journal's pattern.