

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 58594

Title: ***Système de stockage adapté pour la conservation de la qualité des produits agricoles.***

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after moderate revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

This manuscript presents a literature-based review of storage systems used for preserving the quality of agricultural products. The topic is relevant because post-harvest losses remain a major challenge affecting food security, farmers' incomes, and sustainable agricultural development, particularly in developing countries. The manuscript discusses traditional and modern storage methods, factors affecting product deterioration, and the importance of scientific storage infrastructure.

Although the topic is important, the manuscript lacks the scientific depth expected of a review article. The review is largely descriptive, the systematic review methodology is insufficiently described, critical analysis is limited, and many conclusions are not adequately supported by recent scientific literature. Considerable revision is therefore required before the manuscript is suitable for publication.

Minor Comments

1. The systematic review methodology is inadequately described

The manuscript states that a systematic literature review was conducted, but essential methodological details are missing.

The authors should clearly describe:

- databases searched (e.g., Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, CAB Abstracts);
- search keywords;
- search period;
- inclusion and exclusion criteria;
- screening procedure;
- number of articles identified, screened, and included;
- quality assessment method.

A PRISMA flow diagram should be included to demonstrate transparency and reproducibility.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. Novelty is limited

The review summarizes established storage technologies but does not clearly identify its unique contribution.

The manuscript should explain:

- what gap in the literature this review addresses;
- how it differs from previous review articles;
- what new conceptual insights or synthesis are provided.

Without this, the article reads more like an educational overview than a scholarly review.

3. Literature coverage is insufficient

Most references are relatively old, and only a few sources are cited.

The review should include recent publications (2020–2026) covering:

- smart storage technologies,
- Internet of Things (IoT)-based storage monitoring,
- precision agriculture,
- controlled atmosphere storage,
- modified atmosphere packaging,
- cold chain logistics,
- renewable-energy-powered cold storage,
- post-harvest digital technologies.

4. Discussion lacks critical analysis

The Discussion mainly summarizes the advantages of storage systems rather than critically evaluating them.

The authors should compare:

- traditional versus modern storage,
- economic feasibility,
- maintenance costs,
- energy requirements,
- environmental sustainability,
- suitability for smallholder farmers.

A comparative analysis would substantially improve the scientific quality.

5. No quantitative synthesis

A review article should summarize evidence quantitatively where possible.

The manuscript should include information such as:

- average post-harvest loss reduction,
- storage efficiency,
- shelf-life extension,
- cost-benefit comparisons,
- adoption rates.

At present, no quantitative synthesis is provided.

6. Figures and tables are absent

The manuscript consists almost entirely of text.

It would benefit from:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- comparison tables,
- conceptual framework diagrams,
- classification of storage technologies,
- flowcharts,
- summary figures.

Visual summaries would greatly improve readability.

7. Storage temperature information requires correction

The manuscript states that refrigerated storage occurs between **50 °C and 200 °C**, which is scientifically incorrect. Refrigerated storage is typically expressed in the range of approximately **0–20 °C**, depending on the commodity.

All temperature ranges should be carefully verified and corrected.

8. Conclusions are overly general

The conclusions simply restate that modern storage is superior.

The manuscript should instead provide:

- practical recommendations,
- research gaps,
- policy implications,
- future technological developments.

Specific Comments

Title

The title appropriately reflects the content.

However, it could be made more specific by indicating that the manuscript is a literature review.

Abstract

The abstract summarizes the study.

However, it should include:

- number of studies reviewed,
- databases searched,
- principal findings,
- practical implications.

Introduction

The Introduction adequately introduces post-harvest losses.

However,

- more recent FAO statistics should be included;
- the research gap should be explicitly stated;
- objectives should be more clearly defined.

Methodology

The methodology section requires Moderate revision.

Simply stating that a systematic review was conducted is insufficient.

Essential reporting guidelines such as PRISMA should be followed.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Results

The Results section primarily lists different storage methods. It should instead organize findings according to:

- storage type,
- commodities,
- advantages,
- disadvantages,
- preservation efficiency,
- implementation costs.

Discussion

The Discussion should include broader comparisons with recent international literature.

Topics such as:

- climate-smart storage,
- sustainable food systems,
- food waste reduction,
- carbon footprint,
- circular economy

would considerably strengthen the manuscript.

Conclusion

The Conclusion should emphasize:

- key findings,
- limitations,
- future research priorities,
- recommendations for policymakers and stakeholders.

References

The reference list is very limited.

Several important international publications on post-harvest technology are missing. The bibliography should be substantially expanded and updated using recent peer-reviewed journal articles.

Language and Presentation

The manuscript is generally understandable.

However, several improvements are needed:

- improve sentence structure;
- reduce repetition;
- standardize terminology;
- ensure consistency in scientific writing;
- correct grammatical and typographical errors.

Professional language editing is recommended.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Strengths

- Addresses an important issue in food security.
- Covers both traditional and modern storage systems.
- Highlights factors affecting post-harvest losses.
- Practical relevance for developing countries.
- Well-organized general structure.

Weaknesses

- Insufficient systematic review methodology.
- Limited novelty.
- Few references and outdated literature.
- Lack of critical analysis.
- No quantitative synthesis.
- No figures or summary tables.
- Scientifically incorrect temperature values.
- Conclusions remain overly general.

Final Recommendation

The manuscript addresses a significant topic related to post-harvest management and agricultural sustainability. However, the current version does not yet meet the standards expected for a systematic review. Moderate improvements are required in the review methodology, literature coverage, critical analysis, presentation of evidence, and scientific accuracy. Incorporating recent research, following established systematic review guidelines, correcting factual inaccuracies, and providing a more analytical synthesis would substantially enhance the manuscript.

Recommendation: Moderate Revision