

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125216
Title of the Manuscript:	Tomato Processing Industry, Post-harvest technology and value addition: Global and Indian prospective- A Scoping Review
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a critical issue for the agricultural and food processing sectors, focusing on the underdeveloped tomato processing industry in India. By providing a detailed comparison between global and Indian post-harvest technologies, the manuscript highlights areas of improvement needed in India to match global standards. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on minimizing post-harvest losses and adding value to tomato crops, which has significant implications for food security, farmer income, and the economy. The relevance of this research is particularly timely due to increasing global demand for processed tomato products.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is mostly appropriate but can be made clearer. I suggest the following alternative: "Post-harvest Technology and Value Addition in the Tomato Processing Industry: A Global and Indian Perspective".</p> <p>This alternative is concise and more aligned with the content of the review.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview but could be improved by:</p> <p>Adding specific details on post-harvest technologies discussed. Highlighting the key challenges faced by the Indian tomato processing industry. Briefly summarizing the potential solutions or recommendations. These additions would provide a more comprehensive snapshot of the manuscript's key points.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections are logically organized and the structure is appropriate. However, some improvements can be made:</p> <p>Group related topics like post-harvest technologies and value addition methods under broader thematic sections. Ensure clear transitions between global and Indian perspectives. A Conclusion section should be added or enhanced to summarize the key findings and propose future directions.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It provides detailed and accurate information on the current state of tomato processing in both global and Indian contexts. The data presented is up-to-date, and the statistics used (e.g., tomato production and processing percentages) are consistent with current reports. However, more detailed analysis of how India can adopt global practices and scale its processing technologies would strengthen the discussion. The technical aspects of post-harvest technologies could also benefit from more in-depth exploration.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>The references used are sufficient, and they include relevant studies from recent years. However, I suggest incorporating more recent references from 2022-2023 to ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest research in tomato processing and post-harvest technologies. This would enhance its academic rigor.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language: The English is generally clear, but there are a few minor grammatical errors that should be corrected. A thorough proofreading would improve readability.</p> <p>Tables: Ensure that the tables are clearly labeled and easy to interpret. For example, in Table 3, the units of measurement for lycopene content should be explicitly stated.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the tomato processing industry, particularly in India, where the sector remains underdeveloped. With some minor revisions to the structure and language, the manuscript will make a strong contribution to the field of agricultural and food processing research.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Strengths: The manuscript is well-researched and provides valuable insights into the tomato processing industry, particularly highlighting the challenges and opportunities in India. It presents a strong comparison between global and Indian practices and identifies key areas for improvement.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement: The abstract can be more detailed, and some parts of the manuscript, like the discussion of post-harvest technologies, could benefit from further elaboration. Minor grammatical issues and structural improvements are needed for better flow and clarity.</p> <p>With these minor revisions, the manuscript would be ready for publication.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Omkar S Kamble</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>India</p>