

Review of: "Tomatoes Unveiled: A Comprehensive Exploration from Cultivation to Culinary and Nutritional Significance"

Isaac Duah Boateng

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have carefully reviewed the manuscript. In general, this is a poor review, and it is not suitable for publication in this journal.

The article fails to provide a topic overview, with significant gaps in the coverage of relevant literature and research findings. The discussion is superficial, lacking in-depth analysis and critical evaluation of existing data. The discussion lacks critical insight and does not meet the standard of this journal.

The manuscript article requires revision in grammar, sentence structure, and reference format. Overused passive voice in the manuscript seems hard to read. Please try to reword the phrases in the active voice. Grammar and punctuation mistakes. For consistency, please use just one English style (a non-variant British or American style, etc.) in the manuscript. There are phrases with verbs in the wrong tense. Sentences with words misspelled. Words are overused or unnecessary. Nouns without a determiner or unnecessary. The level of English throughout your manuscript does not meet the journal's desired standard.

Considering these significant issues, I am not recommending the publication of this article. Provide page numbers (line numbers as well, if possible). Page and line numbers make it easier for reviewers and authors to make comments, suggestions, responses, etc.

Below are my comments.

The title is vague.

This is a poor abstract.

You should first draft it like this:

Background (2 to 3 sentences)

Scope and approach (2 to 4 sentences)

Key findings

This should cover >60% of the abstract

Conclusions (2 to 3 sentences)

After you draft it like this, then you remove the sections (background, scope & approach, key findings, and conclusions) and merge all the sentences together.

Introduction

A bibliometric analysis of the growth of importance of this topic over the years (past 5 or 10 years) must be done (using Web of Science), VOS viewer, or lens.org, and a plot with an associated explanation must be added.

Look at these papers as a guide.

Chen, W., Ma, H., & Wang, Y. Y. (2022). Recent advances in modified food proteins by high intensity ultrasound for enhancing functionality: Potential mechanisms, combination with other methods, equipment innovations and future directions. *Ultrasonics sonochemistry*, 85, 105993.

Ogundipe, S.O., Usack, J.G., Pegg, R.B. et al. Thermal and Non-thermal Processing on the Physical and Chemical Properties of Tree Nuts: A Review. *Food Bioprocess Technol* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-023-03314-8>

General comments

Compare the results in this study with the most recent related literature and critically evaluate the trends/similarities/differences. What you wrote seems like a book chapter rather than an article to be published in a top journal. Critically discuss.

When crafting your review article, remember to consider the reader's perspective. Look beyond providing a summary of the scientific literature in your topic area and illuminate the cutting-edge and most important paths to the future. You will likely inspire other scientists to accelerate their work more efficiently toward solving critical nutrition and food science challenges.

This paper should be rejected!