

Review of: "Persimmon Preservation: Navigating Tradition, Innovation, and Sustainability for a Holistic Future"

Joshua Ombaka Owade¹

¹ Michigan State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Whereas the articles delve into the discussion of the postharvest practices in the Introduction section, and this emerges as a factor all through the manuscript, the manuscript has gaps in identifying the challenge. Postharvest practices are meant to address postharvest losses, and the manuscript does not provide this background information in the introduction. The introduction needs to be improved to be sequentially written. There is a mix-up of the scope in the introduction, and the rationale is not well presented.

The authors present facts that persimmon is rich in nutrients, though not empirical data to support this. Literature must have data on nutritional composition.

The authors need to be explicit on the problem the comprehensive review is addressing. As it is, the manuscript seems to lack a compelling case why a comprehensive review is needed. The goals and the objectives of the review are not also spelt out.

Whereas the authors present a summary of the processing of the produce and show the challenges arising from the techniques, I feel the section falls short of presenting the findings in a scientific way. The authors should present primary data of studies showing the success of such approaches and empirical data of any demerits registered.

What validates processing techniques and supports the selection of one over the other is the impact on the quality as a whole. Without this information, the presented information on quality adds no much value.

Rather than the term "traditional preservation," use the term "conventional methods." This is because "traditional" may not be a global term for all areas. Techniques like canning may not necessarily be traditional in some settings.

The factors presented as influencing the shelf-life of persimmon may not be accurate. The factors presented in this section are preservation techniques rather. The factors are not well elucidated, and this is not outrightly available to readers from the manuscript.

The section on **Innovative Approaches for Enhancing Persimmon Shelf Life** has great insights, though I find this section short of presenting any new emerging studies on the utilization of these edible coatings. The authors should rather synthesize the findings in the articles rather than just providing citations.

The section on challenges has the paragraph mixed up. Climate change and pests are mentioned, though these

are not exhaustively discussed by the authors; thus, no gap in literature can be identified from the information presented.

Typos occur in the manuscript, and the authors can improve these by proofreading.

Since the empirical data is not presented, it is quite hard, by just reading this manuscript, to identify knowledge gaps. It is therefore difficult to phrase a conclusion by just summarizing the findings in this study, while pointing out possible future research directions, as was the aim from the onset, as per the title.