

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54606

Date: 03.11.2025

**Title:** Inventaire des méthodes de conservation des graines du niébé (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.) face à *Callosobruchus maculatus* Fab.

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

**Accept after minor revision** .....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Date: 03.11.2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

#### General Comments

The paper presents a relevant and practical study on the storage and conservation methods of *Vigna unguiculata* (cowpea) against *Callosobruchus maculatus* in two departments of Niger. The research topic is highly significant for post-harvest management and food security in West Africa. The manuscript is generally well-documented, with both French and English abstracts included. However, the paper would benefit from better clarity, language polishing, and tighter integration between results and discussion. The presentation of figures and tables needs improvement for readability and formatting consistency.

#### Content and Originality

The study provides valuable insights into regional variations in storage practices and the influence of demographic and environmental factors. It addresses a known issue—post-harvest losses in cowpea—but approaches it from a socio-agricultural and practical perspective through field surveys and comparative statistical analysis.

However, the originality is **moderate**, as similar studies exist across West Africa (e.g., Niger, Burkina Faso, Benin). The paper would gain in originality if it included **novel recommendations**, local innovations, or a comparative analysis with existing national programs or technologies (e.g., PICS adoption rates, neem biocontrol effectiveness).

#### Technical Quality

The technical execution appears solid, with a clearly defined sampling frame (346 producers), proper statistical methods (ANOVA, Chi-square, Dunn test), and data collection via semi-structured questionnaires.

However, several issues need attention:

- The **statistical analysis** section could include exact *p*-values and confidence intervals for key comparisons.
- Figures and tables require proper captions, numbering consistency, and integration within the text.
- There is no clear indication of how missing data or non-responses were handled.
- Some data (e.g., Table 3 and associated tests) lack clarity on replication and variance explanation.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Overall, the methodology is appropriate but needs better **technical detailing and interpretation depth**.

### Language and Presentation

The paper contains several **grammatical and typographical errors**, especially in the English abstract and discussion sections.

Examples:

- "The studycarried out..." → should be "The study was carried out..."
- "Callosobruchus maculatusFab." → missing spacing and punctuation.
- Some sentences are overly long and complex, affecting readability.

Recommendations:

- Use consistent scientific formatting for Latin names (*Vigna unguiculata*, *Callosobruchus maculatus*).
- Revise for grammatical accuracy and fluency in both French and English.
- Consider professional language editing to meet journal standards.

### Structure and Organization

The manuscript follows a clear and logical structure — Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and References.

However:

- The **Results** section is extensive and descriptive, with limited synthesis. Tables and figures should be referenced immediately after discussion of their content.
- The **Discussion** repeats many result details instead of interpreting them.
- A **Conclusion** section is missing — this is essential to summarize findings, implications, and recommendations.
- Subsections should be consistently numbered and titled (some parts are unnumbered).

Overall, good structure but needs improved **flow and summary emphasis**.

### References and Citations

The references are numerous and relevant, including regional and international studies.

However:

- Citation formatting is inconsistent (e.g., some use parentheses incorrectly, inconsistent years, missing page numbers).
- The reference list should follow a uniform style (APA, Harvard, or journal-specific).
- Several references (e.g., Arnaud, 2025; Souleymane, 2023) appear to be unpublished or unavailable—verification is needed.
- Ensure all in-text citations appear in the reference list and vice versa.

### Overall Recommendation

#### Recommendation: Minor Revision

The paper is **worth publishing after substantial revisions**. It contributes meaningfully to knowledge on cowpea post-harvest conservation practices but requires:

- Language and presentation improvement.
- Better integration between sections (Results ↔ Discussion).
- A clear conclusion and practical recommendations.
- Reference and figure/table standardization.

### Final Decision:

**Minor Revision Required**

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*