

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_124680
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of producers post-harvest practices and quality of cashew nuts ( <i>Anacardium Occidentale</i> L) produced in five localities in the sub-prefecture of Katogo (Côte d'Ivoire).
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<b>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.</b>	Studying cashew nut post-harvest practices and quality in Côte d'Ivoire is crucial for the scientific community in terms of several reasons like for understanding local practices and to provide insights into the unique methods employed by producers in Côte d'Ivoire. By evaluating the current practices, researchers can identify areas for improvement, such as reducing losses, enhancing quality, or developing more efficient techniques. Besides, this manuscript will also contribute to the global knowledge by comparing to studies from other areas which leads to a more comprehensive understanding of cashew nut post-harvest management and its impact on quality.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is clear and concise and effectively conveys the study's focus on evaluating post-harvest practices and quality in the study area. However, the title requires a little modification as follows:  'Comparative study of producer's post-harvest practices and quality of cashew nuts ( <i>Anacardium Occidentale</i> L.) produced in five localities in the sub-prefecture of Katog, Far North of Côte d'Ivoire.'	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Generally the abstract provides a good insight for the study. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved and by incorporating the suggested improvements, the abstract can be made more comprehensive and informative.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <b>Sampling:</b> The abstract mentions that a survey was conducted among producers in 5 localities. It would be helpful to know the specific sampling method used (e.g., random sampling, stratified sampling). Additionally, the number of producers surveyed in each locality could be included to provide a better understanding of the sample size.</li> <li>✓ <b>Data collection:</b> The abstract states that quality parameters of the cashew nuts produced were determined according to the Ivorian standard. More information could be provided about the specific methods used to measure these parameters (e.g., moisture content, kernel yield, defect rate).</li> </ul> <p><b>Result and discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The abstract presents some of the key findings regarding post-harvest practices and quality parameters. However, it would be beneficial to include more specific information about the differences in post-harvest practices between the 5 localities and the corresponding impact on quality. Moreover, the abstract could discuss the implications of the findings for cashew nut producers and the potential for improving quality and income.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendation could be further strengthened by providing more specific guidance on how to implement these operations effectively. For example, the abstract could suggest training programs, extension services, or access to improved storage facilities.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript follows a standard research paper structure, including, introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. Moreover it clearly states the problem, its significance, and the research objectives. However, there are a few areas where the structure could be improved:</p> <p><b>1. In the introduction part, the author/s should consider the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Consider adding a brief overview of cashew nut production in Côte d'Ivoire before delving into the quality issues, to provide more context for the reader.</li> <li>✓ The problem statement could be strengthened by quantifying the impact of low-quality cashew</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>nuts on the economy or producers' livelihoods.</p> <p><b>2. Materials and Methods:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The subsection "Sampling of cashew nut producers" could be combined with "Survey" to streamline the presentation.</li> <li>✓ Consider adding a subsection on ethical considerations if any specific permissions or informed consent were obtained from the producers.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider adding a brief summary of the key findings at the beginning of the Results section.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The discussion could be strengthened by comparing the findings to those of other studies on cashew nut quality in Côte d'Ivoire or other regions.</li> <li>• Consider discussing the limitations of the study and potential areas for future research.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript clearly states its objective, the research design, including the sociological survey and cashewnut quality analysis; the statistical analysis methods used and the <b>discussion</b> section which effectively links the findings to existing literature and provides insights into the implications of the results. However, there are some potential areas of improvement as mentioned below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <b>Sample Size:</b> A larger sample size could provide more robust statistical results and increase the generalizability of the findings.</li> <li>✓ <b>Control Group:</b> Consider including a control group to compare the cashew nut quality of producers who follow recommended post-harvest practices with those who do not.</li> <li>✓ <b>Longitudinal Study:</b> This provides insights into the long-term effects of post-harvest practices on cashew nut quality.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes.</b></p>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language used is generally clear, concise, and academic in tone. However, there are a few areas where the language could be improved to enhance clarity and precision. Here are my specific observations on the given manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ <b>Word Choice and Sentence Structure:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There are a few instances where the word choice could be more precise. For example, in the introduction, "<b>This drop in quality and the low outturn value is due to the immaturity of the nuts which is linked to a nutritional deficiency</b>" could be rephrased as "This decline in quality and low yield is attributed to the immaturity of the nuts, which is associated with nutritional deficiency."</li><li>○ Some sentences could be simplified for better readability. For instance, "<b>Despite all these very appreciable results from this sector, producers are faced with a quality problem of raw cashew nuts which impacts the marketing price on the market</b>" could be revised as "Despite these positive results, producers face a quality issue with raw cashew nuts that affects their market price."</li></ul></li><li>✓ <b>Academic Conventions:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ While the article generally adheres to academic conventions, there are a few instances where the formatting could be improved. For example, the use of abbreviations like "CCA" should be defined upon first use.</li><li>○ The use of citations is generally appropriate, but there might be opportunities to provide more context for certain references, especially if they are less well-known.</li></ul></li><li>• <b>Clarity and Precision:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ In some sections, the meaning could be clarified through more specific language. For instance, when discussing "<b>foreign matter</b>" in the cashew nuts, providing a more detailed description of what this might include (e.g., stones, dirt, insect parts) would be helpful.</li></ul></li></ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Through addressing the above mentioned minor issues, the article can be further strengthened and meet the high standards expected for scholarly communication.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Haile Abebe Gebrekidan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Mekhoni Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia</b>