Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_130247**
Title of the Manuscript:	
	Comparative Evaluation of Nutritional and Antinutritional Qualities of Local and Breeder Tomato Improved Varieties
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal'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

Review Form 3

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes valuable insights into the nutritional and antinutritional profiles of tomato varieties. It highlights the advantages of breeder-improved varieties, especially in terms of vitamin C, protein, and mineral content, while also discussing the potential of local varieties for targeted nutritional benefits like higher carbohydrates and phenolic compounds. Such studies are crucial for agricultural development and public health, ensuring the selection of varieties best suited for dietary and farming purposes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is appropriate as it clearly reflects the study's focus. However, it could be refined for clarity: Suggested Title: *Comparative Nutritional and Antinutritional Analysis of Local and Breeder-Improved Tomato Varieties.*	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could be slightly refined for brevity by reducing repetitive phrases. Consider emphasizing key findings and their implications succinctly.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound. The use of established methods (e.g., AOAC) and statistical analyses ensures reliability. However, the inclusion of detailed figures for all significant findings would enhance clarity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are relevant and sufficiently recent. Adding more studies related to the bioavailability of minerals in tomatoes could enrich the discussion.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical corrections and rephrasing for conciseness are recommended in sections like the abstract and discussion.	
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Yashwant Kumar Patel**
Department, University & Country	**Atal Bihari Vajpayee Vishwavidyalaya, India**