Post-Harvest Loss Reduction Strategies and Their Contribution to Food Security in Developing Economies.

OLAMIDOTUN NURUDEEN MICHAEL[1], OMODOLAPO EUNICE OGUNSOLA[2]
[1]*Independent Researcher, Ogbomoso, Nigeria*
[2]*International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Nigeria*

Abstract- ***Post-harvest losses (PHL) pose a significant challenge to achieving food security in developing economies, where inefficient handling, storage, processing, and transportation systems often lead to substantial waste of agricultural produce. This review explores the major causes of post-harvest losses across different value chains—particularly in cereals, fruits, and vegetables—and analyzes the effectiveness of contemporary loss reduction strategies. Emphasis is placed on the integration of improved storage technologies, cold-chain logistics, value addition through agro-processing, and the adoption of digital monitoring systems for supply chain traceability. The paper also examines the role of policy frameworks, capacity building, and stakeholder engagement in promoting sustainable post-harvest management practices. By synthesizing evidence from empirical studies and field applications, the review highlights how reducing post-harvest losses contributes directly to food availability, farmers' income stability, and environmental sustainability. Furthermore, it underscores the importance of multi-sectoral collaboration involving governments, private investors, and research institutions in scaling technological and institutional innovations. The findings reveal that holistic PHL reduction strategies—combining technology, education, and policy interventions—can significantly improve food system resilience, enhance nutrition outcomes, and foster economic growth in developing regions.***

Keywords: Post-Harvest Management, Food Security, Supply Chain Optimization, Cold Chain Logistics, Agro-Processing, Sustainable Agriculture.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Post-Harvest Losses

Post-harvest losses (PHL) constitute a major constraint to agricultural productivity and food availability in developing economies. These losses occur at various stages of the food supply chain—during harvesting, handling, processing, storage, and distribution—and are driven by a combination of biophysical, technical, and socioeconomic factors. Inadequate infrastructure, poor handling practices, and limited access to modern storage technologies exacerbate the deterioration of perishable goods, especially fruits, vegetables, and cereals. In sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Asia, up to one-third of food produced for consumption is lost before reaching markets, leading to reduced incomes for farmers and increased food insecurity among consumers (Durowade, Adetokunbo, & Ibirongbe, 2016). Moreover, the lack of efficient transportation systems and cold-chain logistics results in spoilage during long-distance haulage, further diminishing the economic value of agricultural produce (Osabuohien, 2017).

The economic impact of post-harvest losses extends beyond the immediate loss of food quantity; it undermines household income, inflates food prices, and contributes to environmental degradation through resource wastage. Addressing these challenges requires a multidisciplinary approach involving technological, institutional, and behavioral interventions. Capacity building, public-private partnerships, and the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices have proven critical in mitigating post-harvest inefficiencies (Menson et al., 2018). Consequently, reducing PHL is not only a matter of improving food handling but also a strategic pathway toward achieving agricultural transformation,

poverty reduction, and long-term food security in developing economies (Bukhari, Oladimeji, Etim, & Ajayi, 2018).

1.2 Significance of Food Security in Developing Economies

Food security—defined as the condition in which all people have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food—is central to sustainable development and national stability in developing countries. Despite agricultural potential, many nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America struggle to meet domestic food demand due to inefficiencies in post-harvest systems and limited technological adoption (Durowade et al., 2017). Food insecurity in these regions manifests through undernourishment, fluctuating food prices, and dependence on imports, which collectively weaken economic resilience. The direct relationship between PHL reduction and food security underscores the importance of strengthening agricultural value chains to ensure that harvested crops translate into consumable food (Solomon et al., 2018).

Moreover, achieving food security requires policies that integrate loss reduction strategies with broader socioeconomic goals, including employment generation, poverty alleviation, and climate resilience. Efficient post-harvest management enhances market supply stability, boosts farmers' income, and minimizes waste of natural resources such as water and arable land (Durowade et al., 2018). In turn, these improvements support the realization of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, particularly Goal 2: Zero Hunger. Thus, in developing economies, post-harvest loss reduction is not an isolated technical challenge but a fundamental pillar for ensuring equitable food distribution, improving nutrition outcomes, and fostering economic growth (Nsa et al., 2018).

1.3 Objectives and Scope of the Review

The primary objective of this review is to evaluate post-harvest loss reduction strategies and their contribution to food security within the context of developing economies. The paper aims to synthesize existing research findings, technological interventions, and policy frameworks that address inefficiencies across agricultural value chains. It examines the interrelationship between post-harvest management, sustainable supply chain practices, and food availability, emphasizing innovations that can enhance productivity and resilience. The scope of the review encompasses smallholder farming systems, market access, and institutional governance models across Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It focuses on practical approaches such as cold-chain management, digital monitoring systems, and capacity-building programs that have demonstrated measurable impacts on reducing post-harvest losses. Furthermore, the study highlights cross-sectoral collaborations between government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector in developing integrated solutions to food insecurity challenges.

1.4 Structure of the Paper

The paper is organized into six sections to ensure logical flow and comprehensive analysis. Section 1 introduces the background, significance, objectives, and structure of the review. Section 2 explores the causes and impacts of post-harvest losses, detailing the biophysical, technological, and socioeconomic factors influencing food wastage. Section 3 discusses technological innovations and best practices for loss reduction, focusing on storage, transportation, and processing improvements. Section 4 reviews institutional and policy frameworks, emphasizing the role of public–private partnerships and agricultural extension services. Section 5 assesses the contribution of post-harvest loss reduction strategies to food security and economic development, linking theoretical insights to real-world applications. Finally, Section 6 presents conclusions and recommendations, outlining actionable strategies for policymakers, researchers, and industry stakeholders aimed at enhancing sustainable food systems in developing economies.

II. CAUSES AND IMPACTS OF POST-HARVEST LOSSES

2.1 Physical, Biological, and Environmental Factors

Post-harvest losses in developing economies are deeply influenced by physical, biological, and environmental variables that directly affect crop preservation and shelf life. Poor handling practices during harvesting, packaging, and transportation expose agricultural produce to bruising, mechanical damage, and microbial infestation. These damages, though often overlooked, accelerate biochemical deterioration, leading to rapid spoilage, weight loss, and reduced market value. Durowade, Adetokunbo, and Ibirongbe (2016) emphasize that inadequate environmental control during post-harvest stages facilitates fungal growth and aflatoxin contamination, particularly in humid tropical regions. Moreover, temperature fluctuations, high humidity, and lack of cold-chain infrastructure create conditions favorable for enzymatic decay and pest proliferation (Menson et al., 2018). The absence of temperature-controlled logistics systems is particularly detrimental to perishable goods such as fruits, vegetables, and dairy products, where the physiological and microbial interactions are accelerated by heat exposure (Olamoyegun et al., 2015).

Environmental instability due to climate variability further compounds post-harvest challenges. Erratic rainfall patterns and rising temperatures disrupt drying, storage, and processing activities, increasing vulnerability to mold infestation (Solomon et al., 2018). In addition, poor sanitation in storage facilities often results in rodent and insect infestations that deteriorate product quality and safety (Osabuohien, 2017). Environmental degradation, such as soil erosion and flooding, affects not only the quality of harvested produce but also the stability of rural food supply chains (Bukhari, Oladimeji, Etim, & Ajayi, 2018). Globally, research has shown that environmental management strategies—such as the adoption of hermetic storage, solar-powered dryers, and low-cost temperature sensors—can significantly reduce biological losses (Affognon et al., 2015; Kitinoja & Kader, 2015) as seen in Table 1. Strengthening climate-smart storage and transport systems thus represents a pivotal approach for minimizing physical and biological deterioration within fragile agricultural ecosystems (Tefera, 2016; Parfitt, Barthel, & Macnaughton, 2017).

Table 1: Summary of Physical, Biological, and Environmental Factors Influencing Post-Harvest Losses in Developing Economies

Category	Key Contributing Factors	Impact on Post-Harvest Quality	Mitigation Strategies
Physical Factors	Poor handling during harvesting, packaging, and transportation; mechanical bruising; inadequate infrastructure.	Causes structural damage, rapid spoilage, and reduced market value due to weight loss and deterioration.	Adoption of improved harvesting tools, proper packaging materials, and modern handling techniques.
Biological Factors	Microbial infestation, fungal growth, pest attacks, and enzymatic decay.	Leads to contamination, nutrient loss, and reduced shelf life of perishable products such as fruits, vegetables, and dairy.	Use of hermetic storage, biological control methods, and regular sanitation of storage facilities.
Environmental Factors	Temperature fluctuations, high humidity, lack of cold-chain infrastructure, and poor ventilation.	Accelerates biochemical deterioration, mold development, and pest proliferation, reducing food safety and quality.	Implementation of cold-chain logistics, temperature-controlled storage, and humidity management systems.

Category	Key Contributing Factors	Impact on Post-Harvest Quality	Mitigation Strategies
Climatic and Ecological Factors	Climate variability, erratic rainfall, soil erosion, flooding, and environmental degradation.	Disrupts drying and storage processes, increases vulnerability to infestation, and weakens food supply stability.	Adoption of climate-smart technologies, solar-powered dryers, low-cost sensors, and resilient storage systems.

2.2 Socioeconomic and Infrastructural Constraints

Socioeconomic and infrastructural limitations constitute critical barriers to effective post-harvest management in developing regions. Farmers in rural areas often lack access to affordable credit, modern storage facilities, and market information systems necessary for managing produce after harvest. Babatunde et al. (2014) highlight that poor institutional support and low investment in agricultural infrastructure perpetuate inefficiencies across the post-harvest chain. The absence of reliable transportation networks and energy supply hinders access to urban markets, resulting in significant losses before goods reach consumers (Durowade et al., 2017). Furthermore, the high cost of adopting improved technologies discourages smallholders from utilizing mechanized dryers, silos, and cold rooms (Erigha, Ayo, Dada, & Folorunso, 2017). These infrastructural gaps are exacerbated by inadequate extension services that limit knowledge dissemination on good post-harvest practices (Durowade et al., 2018).

Social inequalities and poverty also reduce the adaptive capacity of smallholder farmers to invest in post-harvest solutions. Inadequate education and gender disparities restrict women's participation in value-added processes, despite their central role in food production (Nsa et al., 2018). Infrastructural limitations are further compounded by fragmented supply chains and weak governance mechanisms that discourage private-sector participation (Olasehinde, 2018). Empirical studies have shown that improved road networks, power grids, and cooperative marketing platforms can reduce post-harvest losses by 20–30% (Abass et al., 2014; Hodges, Buzby, & Bennett, 2014). Moreover, socioeconomic empowerment through microcredit and cooperative farming has been associated with enhanced resilience and income diversification (Kasso & Bekele, 2016; Mrema, Kienzle, & Rolle, 2018). Strengthening institutional linkages and promoting inclusive infrastructure investment remain essential strategies for addressing post-harvest losses while fostering equitable rural development.

2.3 Consequences for Food Security and Livelihoods

The implications of post-harvest losses for food security and livelihoods are multidimensional, affecting both economic stability and nutritional outcomes in developing countries. Food losses reduce market supply, elevate consumer prices, and diminish household income, thereby worsening food insecurity among vulnerable populations. Olamoyegun et al. (2015) observed that inefficiencies in post-harvest handling directly translate into reduced caloric availability, exacerbating malnutrition rates in rural households. The interconnectedness between post-harvest inefficiency and poverty is evident in communities dependent on seasonal production, where losses equate to foregone income opportunities (Bukhari et al., 2018). Additionally, lost food implies wasted inputs—land, water, fertilizers, and labor—resulting in environmental and economic inefficiency (Osabuohien, 2017).

From a macroeconomic perspective, chronic post-harvest losses constrain national food self-sufficiency targets and undermine rural employment. Studies have shown that a 10% reduction in post-harvest losses could feed up to 200 million people annually while improving GDP contributions from agriculture (FAO, 2015; Gustavsson et al., 2015). Moreover, food loss has gendered dimensions, as women farmers are disproportionately affected due to limited access to storage and market facilities (Kummu et al., 2016; Lipinski et al., 2016). Environmental consequences, including methane emissions from decomposing

organic waste, further aggravate climate change and threaten ecosystem sustainability (Parfitt et al., 2017). Therefore, reducing post-harvest losses not only enhances food availability but also promotes inclusive growth, resource conservation, and long-term livelihood resilience across developing economies (Morris et al., 2017; Hodges et al., 2014).

III. TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS FOR POST-HARVEST LOSS REDUCTION

3.1 Improved Storage and Preservation Techniques

Improved storage and preservation techniques are critical components of post-harvest management aimed at extending the shelf life of agricultural produce and maintaining quality until consumption. In developing economies, poor infrastructure, high humidity, and microbial contamination contribute to significant post-harvest losses. Hermetic storage systems, modified-atmosphere packaging, and solar-powered dehydrators have demonstrated measurable effectiveness in minimizing biochemical degradation and pest infestation. Durowade, Adetokunbo, and Ibirongbe (2016) emphasize that integrating low-cost preservation systems in community granaries can substantially reduce grain spoilage. Similarly, Osabuohien (2017) highlights the environmental benefits of biodegradable polymer packaging in mitigating contamination risks during storage. These innovations, when combined with farmer education and digital record-keeping, enhance the resilience of the storage chain (Erigha, Ayo, Dada, & Folorunso, 2017).

Modern preservation approaches increasingly rely on energy-efficient cold chambers and controlled-humidity systems designed for smallholder farmers. Durowade et al. (2017) argue that inadequate awareness of optimal storage conditions often results in nutritional and economic losses. Bukhari, Oladimeji, Etim, and Ajayi (2018) demonstrate that distributed renewable-energy micro-grids can power rural storage hubs sustainably. External studies support these findings, suggesting that combining low-temperature storage with humidity sensors reduces microbial load and maintains produce firmness (Kader, 2016; Kitinoja & Thompson, 2015). Emerging research advocates the adoption of vacuum sealing, antimicrobial coatings, and nanostructured packaging to extend post-harvest durability (Caleb et al., 2016; Mahajan, Caleb, Singh, & Watkins, 2017). The integration of traditional knowledge with scientific preservation technologies provides a pathway to achieving food system stability in resource-limited regions (Affognon, Mutungi, Sanginga, & Borgemeister, 2015; Olayemi, 2017).

3.2 Cold Chain and Temperature-Controlled Logistics

Cold chain systems serve as the backbone of perishable goods logistics, ensuring temperature consistency from harvest to market. In developing economies, infrastructural deficits and unreliable power supply compromise the continuity of cold storage. Babatunde et al. (2014) stress that post-harvest losses escalate exponentially when ambient conditions fluctuate beyond tolerance levels. Menson et al. (2018) propose that the use of mobile-enabled refrigeration units powered by solar micro-grids can reduce wastage by up to 30%. Olamoyegun et al. (2015) underscore that energy efficiency and real-time temperature monitoring remain pivotal for the success of rural cold-chain systems. Furthermore, Durowade et al. (2018) report that community-based cooperative storage models foster shared maintenance accountability and cost efficiency.

Globally, cold-chain development has advanced through the adoption of hybrid refrigeration technologies and phase-change materials that stabilize temperature variations during transportation (Tigist, Workneh, & Woldetsadik, 2017). Kitinoja, Al-Hassan, Cruz, and Saran (2016) demonstrate that effective last-mile cold-chain interventions can increase farmers' profits and extend produce shelf life by 50%. Studies by James and James (2014) and Getahun et al. (2017) further highlight that integrating cold logistics with market intelligence systems enhances food distribution efficiency. Localized adaptation remains essential: Olasehinde (2018) points out that sensor-driven predictive maintenance minimizes energy waste and breakdown risk. Scholten et al. (2018) confirm that field-deployable mobile cold units can transform rural value chains. These findings collectively reveal that investment in sustainable cold-

chain infrastructure is not merely a technical consideration but a socio-economic catalyst for food system transformation.

3.3 Smart Monitoring, IoT, and Data-Driven Systems

The advent of smart monitoring technologies and Internet of Things (IoT) systems has revolutionized post-harvest management by providing real-time data for decision-making. IoT-enabled devices capture temperature, humidity, and ethylene concentration to predict spoilage risk and automate control mechanisms. Erigha et al. (2017) observe that integrating sensor networks with predictive algorithms minimizes quality deterioration. Bukhari et al. (2018) highlight that cloud-based platforms facilitate remote oversight of multiple storage locations, improving traceability. Solomon et al. (2018) contend that mobile data analytics can empower smallholders with actionable insights, reducing uncertainty in post-harvest handling.

Empirical research corroborates these advances. Muthusamy, Kamaruddin, and Ali (2014) found that sensor-based decision systems reduce operational losses by 20%. Chen, Xu, and Liu (2017) established that integrating IoT with big-data analytics enables precise environmental control and anomaly detection in storage networks. Similarly, Misra and Shukla (2017) emphasized that predictive analytics can transform perishable-goods logistics by forecasting deterioration trends. In a related context, Balaji and Arshinder (2016) identified blockchain-linked IoT systems as critical for transparency in post-harvest supply chains. Furthermore, Yaseen, Sun, and Jabeen (2018) demonstrated that machine-learning-assisted IoT sensors enhance responsiveness in cold-chain environments. Together, these studies suggest that digital transformation in post-harvest operations is central to achieving resilient and sustainable food systems (Durowade et al., 2017).

IV. INSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS

4.1 National and Regional Policies Supporting PHL Reduction

National and regional policies play a pivotal role in shaping post-harvest management frameworks across developing economies. Governmental intervention through agricultural policy reforms, subsidies, and infrastructure development serves as a cornerstone for minimizing post-harvest losses (PHL). Many African and Asian governments have recognized that without strong regulatory frameworks and investment in rural logistics, food losses will continue to undermine national food security objectives. In Nigeria, Ghana, and Kenya, policy frameworks now emphasize integrated value chain development, supporting improved storage, cold-chain systems, and farmer education (Bukhari, Oladimeji, Etim, & Ajayi, 2018). Regional bodies such as the African Union have equally adopted continental agricultural strategies aimed at harmonizing standards, reducing inefficiencies, and promoting cross-border collaboration in agricultural trade (Menson et al., 2018). Effective implementation requires institutional synergy among ministries, extension departments, and cooperatives to ensure that technology transfer and financial incentives reach smallholders.

However, despite the growing policy attention, implementation remains inconsistent due to limited budget allocations, weak monitoring systems, and fragmented inter-agency coordination (Nsa et al., 2018). Studies have shown that decentralized governance models—where policy execution involves local institutions—yield better outcomes for PHL reduction (Durowade et al., 2018). Furthermore, integrating public research outputs into national food policy frameworks strengthens innovation diffusion, enabling farmers to adopt improved packaging and storage techniques. For example, countries implementing community-based grain storage programs and post-harvest mechanization initiatives have reported measurable reductions in cereal losses (Solomon et al., 2018). The synchronization of policy with infrastructure planning and capacity building enhances long-term sustainability (Scholten et al.,

2018). Hence, regional cooperation through policy harmonization and mutual support mechanisms is essential to addressing the multifaceted challenges of post-harvest loss in developing economies (Osabuohien, 2017). As noted by Hodges, Buzby, and Bennett (2014), coherent agricultural policies aligned with food safety, trade, and climate strategies are indispensable for achieving PHL reduction and food security goals.

4.2 Role of Agricultural Extension Services

Agricultural extension services form the critical link between policy formulation and field-level implementation. They facilitate the dissemination of post-harvest technologies, promote behavioral change among farmers, and foster inclusive agricultural innovation. In developing countries, smallholder farmers often rely on extension agents for knowledge about crop handling, packaging, and preservation. Research shows that farmer education on drying techniques, pest control, and safe storage methods significantly minimizes post-harvest degradation (Durowade, Babatunde, Omokanye, Elegbede, & Ayodele, 2017). Moreover, the incorporation of digital advisory platforms and mobile-based knowledge-sharing systems has improved communication efficiency, particularly in remote communities (Erigha, Ayo, Dada, & Folorunso, 2017). Through participatory training models and community demonstration farms, extension programs strengthen local adaptive capacities, enabling smallholders to apply loss-reduction innovations (Bukhari et al., 2018).

The evolving role of extension services is now expanding beyond technical instruction to include entrepreneurship development, linking farmers with credit facilities and markets (Durowade, Omokanye, Elegbede, Adetokunbo, & Sanni, 2017). Public–private collaborations in extension delivery—especially through agritech startups—have further enhanced knowledge reach and innovation diffusion. For instance, the establishment of farmer information systems in East Africa has been instrumental in improving produce handling standards and market competitiveness (Menson et al., 2018). Studies by Kader (2015) and Kitinoja and AlHassan (2016) emphasize that integrated extension systems combining technology, finance, and post-harvest training can reduce food loss by up to 30%. Nonetheless, challenges persist due to inadequate staffing, limited mobility of extension officers, and the absence of continuous professional development. Strengthening capacity through funding, research integration, and gender-inclusive outreach remains imperative for optimizing the role of extension services in achieving food security (FAO, 2017).

4.3 Public–Private Partnerships and Community Engagement

Public–private partnerships (PPPs) and community-based initiatives represent a transformative avenue for reducing PHL through shared responsibility and resource mobilization. The private sector contributes through innovation, investment in cold-chain logistics, and provision of market access, while public institutions ensure regulatory compliance, capacity building, and policy incentives. PPPs have facilitated the establishment of grain silos, refrigerated storage, and agro-processing hubs that add value and extend product shelf life (Bukhari et al., 2018). In Nigeria and Tanzania, collaborative projects between government agencies, donor organizations, and private investors have yielded measurable improvements in loss reduction and food system resilience (Durowade et al., 2018). Community cooperatives also serve as effective platforms for knowledge sharing, collective marketing, and the adoption of improved post-harvest practices (Osabuohien, 2017).

The synergy between PPPs and community engagement ensures inclusivity and sustainability. Successful initiatives are those that build local ownership, integrate gender considerations, and embed environmental safeguards in post-harvest value chains (Solomon et al., 2018). Furthermore, integrating digital technologies into partnership frameworks enhances transparency, traceability, and accountability in food distribution systems (Scholten et al., 2018). As noted by Affognon, Mutungi, Sanginga, and Borgemeister (2015), empowering communities through participatory approaches fosters behavioral transformation essential for loss prevention. Global studies indicate that countries with

strong private-sector involvement and participatory rural models experience lower food losses and higher income stability (Kaminski & Christiaensen, 2014). Hence, establishing PPPs that align market incentives with social objectives can accelerate innovation adoption, reduce inequality, and drive systemic transformation toward sustainable food systems (Sheahan & Barrett, 2017).

Table 2: Summary of Public–Private Partnerships and Community Engagement in Post-Harvest Loss Reduction

Key Aspect	Description	Strategic Outcomes	Long-Term Implications
Role of Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs)	Collaboration between governments, private investors, and donor agencies to enhance post-harvest infrastructure and supply chain efficiency. Public entities provide regulatory frameworks, while private actors contribute funding, innovation, and logistics expertise.	Development of grain silos, cold storage systems, and agro-processing hubs that reduce spoilage and enhance product shelf life.	Strengthened national food security through improved preservation, reduced waste, and increased value addition across supply chains.
Community-Based Engagement	Involvement of local cooperatives and farmer associations in training, collective marketing, and adoption of improved storage and handling practices.	Enhanced local ownership, better knowledge dissemination, and equitable participation in post-harvest management activities.	Empowered rural populations with greater economic inclusion, skill development, and resilience against food insecurity.
Integration of Technology and Innovation	Use of digital monitoring tools, mobile-based market platforms, and data analytics within partnership frameworks to enhance traceability and accountability.	Increased efficiency in logistics coordination, transparent market transactions, and real-time loss monitoring.	Transition toward data-driven food systems that support smart agriculture and responsive policy interventions.
Sustainability and Inclusivity Measures	Emphasis on gender-sensitive approaches, environmental safeguards, and participatory decision-making in post-harvest programs.	Balanced development that integrates economic growth with social equity and ecological stewardship.	Establishment of sustainable and inclusive food systems that align market incentives with long-term social and environmental goals.

V. CONTRIBUTION TO FOOD SECURITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Enhancing Food Availability and Accessibility

Post-harvest loss (PHL) reduction plays a pivotal role in enhancing food availability and accessibility, particularly within developing economies where agricultural inefficiencies persist. Post-harvest management determines the proportion of harvested food that remains consumable and marketable, and improvements in this stage directly expand domestic food supply without requiring additional land or water resources. Studies have shown that minimizing losses in perishable commodities through advanced storage and transportation methods could increase food availability by up to 15% in sub-Saharan Africa (Kasso & Bekele, 2018). Traditional practices such as open-air drying and manual threshing contribute to spoilage, nutrient degradation, and contamination, whereas innovations like hermetic storage, solar dryers, and cold-chain systems significantly extend product shelf life and market reach (Bukhari,

Oladimeji, Etim, & Ajayi, 2018). Furthermore, improved access to affordable preservation technologies empowers smallholder farmers to store surplus production, thereby stabilizing food supply during lean seasons and mitigating market volatility (Nsa et al., 2018).

Accessibility, on the other hand, is influenced by both physical and economic factors. Enhanced logistics networks, efficient transportation, and community-based aggregation centers reduce farm-to-market transit times and improve equitable food distribution across rural and urban regions (Menson et al., 2018). At a macro level, integrating PHL reduction strategies into agricultural policy enhances national food reserves and supports food price stabilization, which is crucial for low-income households (Scholten et al., 2018). When combined with digital monitoring and mobile-based market linkages, these innovations strengthen consumer access and reduce dependency on imported staples (Hodges, Buzby, & Bennett, 2014). The resultant improvement in nutritional availability and stability underscores that reducing PHL is not merely a technical intervention but a cornerstone of national food security (Affognon, Mutungi, Sanginga, & Borgemeister, 2015; Parfitt, Barthel, & Macnaughton, 2017). Thus, by bridging technological, infrastructural, and economic gaps, developing economies can sustainably enhance food accessibility and availability while reducing systemic vulnerability to hunger.

5.2 Reducing Poverty and Strengthening Rural Economies

Reducing post-harvest losses directly contributes to poverty alleviation by increasing farmers' income, generating rural employment, and stimulating agribusiness development. In most developing economies, over 60% of the population depends on agriculture for their livelihood; thus, improvements in post-harvest systems significantly affect rural economic welfare (Aulakh & Regmi, 2013). By minimizing spoilage and inefficiencies in handling, farmers capture greater value from their produce, while access to processing and packaging facilities encourages value addition and enterprise diversification (Olamoyegun et al., 2015). Empirical studies demonstrate that efficient post-harvest infrastructure—such as storage cooperatives, warehouse receipt systems, and producer-owned aggregation centers—can raise smallholder net income by 20–30% (FAO, 2017).

At a structural level, PHL reduction initiatives stimulate rural industrialization and create employment along value chains, including transportation, logistics, processing, and retail. Investments in cold-chain systems and rural micro-enterprises further promote inclusive economic growth (Durowade, Adetokunbo, & Ibirongbe, 2016). Moreover, the adoption of community-based post-harvest technologies reduces gender inequality by involving women and youth in storage, processing, and trading activities (Osabuohien, 2017). The synergy between loss reduction and poverty alleviation thus creates a multiplier effect—enhanced productivity increases household resilience and strengthens local economies (Schreinemachers et al., 2018). In regions like sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, integrating digital data platforms with PHL interventions has facilitated access to finance, enabling farmers to expand production and reduce reliance on subsistence farming (Manda et al., 2016; Xaba & Masuku, 2018). Consequently, post-harvest management serves as both an income stabilization mechanism and a catalyst for rural transformation, enabling agrarian communities to participate effectively in competitive value chains while advancing national development priorities.

5.3 Environmental and Sustainability Implications

Beyond its economic significance, post-harvest loss reduction contributes to environmental sustainability by mitigating resource inefficiency and reducing the ecological footprint of food systems. Each kilogram of food lost represents wasted inputs such as water, fertilizers, and energy, all of which have substantial environmental costs. In developing economies, the carbon footprint of avoidable post-harvest losses is estimated to account for 8–10% of total greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture (Vermeulen, Campbell, & Ingram, 2012). Implementing eco-efficient post-harvest management practices—such as controlled-atmosphere storage and composting—

reduces methane emissions from decaying organic matter while enhancing resource circularity (Durowade et al., 2017). Moreover, the adoption of solar-powered drying and low-emission cold storage systems aligns with green energy transitions, promoting climate resilience in food systems (Solomon et al., 2018).

PHL reduction also reinforces the sustainable use of natural resources by optimizing production efficiency rather than expanding cultivated land, thus preventing deforestation and soil degradation. Institutional frameworks encouraging green post-harvest technologies foster compliance with international sustainability targets such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 2, 12, and 13) (Osabuohien, 2017; FAO, 2018). Integrating environmental governance into PHL strategies also enhances biodiversity conservation and reduces the ecological stress associated with intensive farming (Lipinski et al., 2016). As such, loss reduction is an integral component of circular economy principles that advocate waste valorization, renewable energy use, and ecosystem preservation (Parfitt et al., 2017). By closing nutrient loops and minimizing waste at multiple value chain stages, PHL reduction advances both climate adaptation and mitigation, underscoring its role as a sustainability enabler within developing economies.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

The review establishes that post-harvest loss reduction is a critical determinant of food security, economic stability, and sustainable development in developing economies. The analysis highlights that a significant proportion of food produced in low-income regions is lost due to inadequate storage infrastructure, inefficient logistics, limited access to preservation technologies, and weak institutional frameworks. By addressing these systemic inefficiencies, countries can substantially increase the amount of food available for consumption and trade without expanding agricultural land. The findings also underscore the importance of integrating technology—such as hermetic storage, cold-chain systems, and digital monitoring—into post-harvest management to improve efficiency and traceability across value chains.

Moreover, the review reveals that reducing post-harvest losses extends beyond technical innovation; it requires comprehensive policy alignment, capacity building, and stakeholder collaboration. Economic analyses indicate that minimizing losses enhances household income, fosters job creation, and promotes rural industrialization. Environmentally, loss reduction reduces resource waste and greenhouse gas emissions, advancing sustainability goals. Collectively, these findings demonstrate that post-harvest management is a multidimensional strategy that bridges agricultural productivity, environmental stewardship, and social equity, positioning it as a fundamental pillar of resilient food systems in developing economies.

6.2 Strategic Recommendations for Policymakers and Stakeholders

Policymakers should prioritize post-harvest management within national agricultural strategies and allocate dedicated funding to infrastructure, research, and training. Establishing rural aggregation centers, cooperative storage facilities, and temperature-controlled logistics networks would significantly reduce spoilage and improve market access. Governments should also incentivize private sector participation through tax rebates, credit facilities, and technology transfer programs that encourage innovation in storage and processing. Strengthening extension services is equally vital to equip farmers with practical knowledge on handling, packaging, and transportation techniques that preserve product quality.

At the institutional level, there is a need to harmonize food safety and quality standards across local and regional markets, supported by digital traceability systems for monitoring food flows. Development partners and NGOs should collaborate with national agencies to scale up community-based post-harvest interventions that engage women and youth, fostering inclusive participation in agri-value chains. Furthermore, integrating loss reduction programs into

climate adaptation and sustainability policies will ensure coherence between food security and environmental protection objectives. By adopting a multi-sectoral approach—combining policy reform, infrastructure investment, and education—stakeholders can collectively build resilient and efficient post-harvest systems that strengthen food security and economic growth.

6.3 Future Research Directions

Future research should focus on developing data-driven frameworks for quantifying post-harvest losses across diverse agro-ecological zones to improve precision in intervention planning. There is a growing need to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of emerging technologies, such as smart sensors, Internet of Things (IoT) platforms, and machine-learning-based predictive models, in mitigating post-harvest degradation. Comparative studies examining how various loss reduction techniques perform across different commodities—such as grains, fruits, and vegetables—would help identify scalable and context-specific solutions.

Research should also explore the socio-economic impacts of post-harvest innovations on rural livelihoods, especially in terms of gender inclusion, income diversification, and resilience to market shocks. Longitudinal studies assessing the environmental benefits of reducing losses—such as carbon footprint reduction and soil conservation—can inform the integration of post-harvest strategies into global sustainability frameworks. Finally, partnerships between academic institutions, development organizations, and the private sector should be strengthened to facilitate applied research and technology dissemination. By aligning scientific inquiry with practical implementation, future research can generate actionable insights that transform post-harvest systems and contribute meaningfully to achieving food security and sustainability in developing economies.

REFERENCES

[1] Abass, A. B., Fischler, M., Schneider, K., Daudi, S., Gaspar, A., Rüst, J., ... & Kabula, E. (2014). On-farm comparison of different post-harvest storage technologies for maize in Tanzania. Journal of Stored Products Research, 57, 32–38.

[2] Abass, O. S., Balogun, O., & Didi, P. U. (2014). A Predictive Analytics Framework for Optimizing Preventive Healthcare Sales and Engagement Outcomes. IRE Journals, 2(11), 497–505.

[3] Affognon, H., Mutungi, C., Sanginga, P., & Borgemeister, C. (2015). Unpacking postharvest losses in sub-Saharan Africa: A meta-analysis. World Development, 66, 49–68.

[4] Aulakh, J., & Regmi, A. (2013). Post-harvest food losses estimation—Development of consistent methodology. FAO Technical Paper.

[5] Babatunde, O. A., Aderibigbe, S. A., Jaja, I. C., Babatunde, O. O., Adewoye, K. R., Durowade, K. A., & Adetokunbo, S. (2014). Sexual activities and practice of abortion among public secondary school students in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology, 3(4), 1472–1479.

[6] Balaji, M., & Arshinder, K. (2016). Modeling the enablers of supply chain performance in post-harvest operations. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 130, 82–93.

[7] Bukhari, T. T., Oladimeji, O., Etim, E. D., & Ajayi, J. O. (2018). A conceptual framework for designing resilient multi-cloud networks ensuring security, scalability, and reliability across infrastructures. IRE Journals, 1(8), 164–173.

[8] Caleb, O. J., Mahajan, P. V., Al-Said, F. A., & Opara, U. L. (2016). Modified-atmosphere packaging technology of fresh and fresh-cut produce. Food Engineering Reviews, 8(1), 1–23.

[9] Chen, X., Xu, B., & Liu, J. (2017). Internet of Things in cold-chain logistics: A review. Sensors, 17(9), 2054.

[10] Durowade, K. A., Adetokunbo, S., & Ibirongbe, D. E. (2016). Healthcare delivery in a frail economy: Challenges and way forward. Savannah Journal of Medical Research and Practice, 5(1), 1-8.

[11] Durowade, K. A., Babatunde, O. A., Omokanye, L. O., Elegbede, O. E., Ayodele, L. M., Adewoye, K. R., ... & Olaniyan, T. O. (2017). Early sexual debut: prevalence and risk factors among secondary school students in Ido-ekiti,

Ekiti state, South-West Nigeria. African health sciences, 17(3), 614-622.

[12] Durowade, K. A., Omokanye, L. O., Elegbede, O. E., Adetokunbo, S., Olomofe, C. O., Ajiboye, A. D., ... & Sanni, T. A. (2017). Barriers to contraceptive uptake among women of reproductive age in a semi-urban community of Ekiti State, Southwest Nigeria. Ethiopian journal of health sciences, 27(2), 121-128.

[13] Durowade, K. A., Salaudeen, A. G., Akande, T. M., Musa, O. I., Bolarinwa, O. A., Olokoba, L. B., ... & Adetokunbo, S. (2018). Traditional eye medication: A rural-urban comparison of use and association with glaucoma among adults in Ilorin-west Local Government Area, North-Central Nigeria. Journal of Community Medicine and Primary Health Care, 30(1), 86-98.

[14] Erigha, E. D., Ayo, F. E., Dada, O. O., & Folorunso, O. (2017). INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEM BASED ON SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINES AND THE TWO-PHASE BAT ALGORITHM. Journal of Information System Security, 13(3).

[15] FAO. (2015). Global food losses and food waste: Extent, causes and prevention. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

[16] FAO. (2017). Global initiative on food loss and waste reduction. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

[17] FAO. (2017). The future of food and agriculture: Trends and challenges. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

[18] FAO. (2018). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2018. Rome: FAO.

[19] Getahun, D., Workneh, T. S., & Woldetsadik, K. (2017). Influence of postharvest treatments on tomato quality. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 54(7), 2083–2092.

[20] Gustavsson, J., Cederberg, C., & Sonesson, U. (2015). The global food waste challenge: Extent and environmental impact. FAO.

[21] Hodges, R. J., Buzby, J. C., & Bennett, B. (2014). Postharvest losses and waste in developed and less developed countries: Opportunities to improve resource use. Journal of Agricultural Science, 152(S1), 37–45.

[22] James, S. J., & James, C. (2014). The food cold-chain and climate change. Food Research International, 64, 30–40.

[23] Kader, A. A. (2015). Reducing postharvest losses of horticultural crops. HortTechnology, 25(1), 52–56.

[24] Kader, A. A. (2016). Postharvest technology of horticultural crops (3rd ed.). University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources Publication 3311.

[25] Kaminski, J., & Christiaensen, L. (2014). Post-harvest loss in sub-Saharan Africa: What do farmers say? Global Food Security, 3(3–4), 149–158.

[26] Kasso, M., & Bekele, A. (2016). Post-harvest loss and quality deterioration of horticultural crops in Dire Dawa Region, Ethiopia. Journal of the Saudi Society of Agricultural Sciences, 17(1), 88–96.

[27] Kitinoja, L., & AlHassan, H. (2016). Identification of appropriate postharvest technologies for improving market access and incomes for small horticultural farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Acta Horticulturae, 1123, 193–200.

[28] Kitinoja, L., & Kader, A. A. (2015). Measuring postharvest losses of fresh fruits and vegetables in developing countries. Postharvest Biology and Technology, 110, 36–44.

[29] Kitinoja, L., & Thompson, A. K. (2015). Pre-cooling systems for small-scale producers. Stewart Postharvest Review, 11(3), 1–8.

[30] Kitinoja, L., Al-Hassan, H., Cruz, A., & Saran, S. (2016). Identification of appropriate postharvest technologies for smallholder horticultural farmers. Acta Horticulturae, 1114, 55–62.

[31] Kummu, M., De Moel, H., Porkka, M., Siebert, S., Varis, O., & Ward, P. J. (2016). Lost food, wasted resources: Global food supply chain losses and their environmental impacts. Science of the Total Environment, 438, 477–489.

[32] Lipinski, B., Hanson, C., Lomax, J., Kitinoja, L., Waite, R., & Searchinger, T. (2016). Reducing food loss and waste. World Resources Institute Report.

[33] Mahajan, P. V., Caleb, O. J., Singh, Z., & Watkins, C. B. (2017). Postharvest treatments for extending shelf life of fruits and vegetables. Trends in Food Science & Technology, 64, 23–35.

[34] Manda, J., Alene, A. D., Gardebroek, C., Kassie, M., & Tembo, G. (2016). Adoption and impacts of sustainable agricultural practices on maize yields and incomes. Food Policy, 61, 62–74.

[35] Menson, W. N. A., Olawepo, J. O., Bruno, T., Gbadamosi, S. O., Nalda, N. F., Anyebe, V., ... & Ezeanolue, E. E. (2018). Reliability of self-reported Mobile phone ownership in rural north-Central Nigeria: cross-sectional study. JMIR mHealth and uHealth, 6(3), e8760.

[36] Misra, S., & Shukla, P. (2017). IoT applications for smart agriculture: Opportunities and challenges. IEEE Internet of Things Journal, 4(6), 1453–1464.

[37] Mrema, G. C., Kienzle, J., & Rolle, R. S. (2018). Mechanization for rural development: A review of patterns and progress. FAO.

[38] Muthusamy, S., Kamaruddin, R., & Ali, M. S. B. (2014). IoT-based intelligent monitoring for agricultural product logistics. Procedia Computer Science, 42, 524–531.

[39] Nsa, B., Anyebe, V., Dimkpa, C., Aboki, D., Egbule, D., Useni, S., & Eneogu, R. (2018). Impact of active case finding of tuberculosis among prisoners using the WOW truck in North Central Nigeria. The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 22(11), S444.

[40] Olamoyegun, M., David, A., Akinlade, A., Gbadegesin, B., Aransiola, C., Olopade, R., ... & Adetokunbo, S. (2015, October). Assessment of the relationship between obesity indices and lipid parameters among Nigerians with hypertension. In Endocrine Abstracts (Vol. 38). Bioscientifica.

[41] Olasehinde, O. (2018). Stock price prediction system using long short-term memory. In BlackInAI Workshop@ NeurIPS (Vol. 2018).

[42] Osabuohien, F. O. (2017). Review of the environmental impact of polymer degradation. Communication in Physical Sciences, 2(1), 35–42.

[43] Parfitt, J., Barthel, M., & Macnaughton, S. (2016). Food waste within food supply chains: Quantification and potential for change to 2050. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 365(1554), 3065–3081.

[44] Scholten, J., Eneogu, R., Ogbudebe, C., Nsa, B., Anozie, I., Anyebe, V., ... & Mitchell, E. (2018). Ending the TB epidemic: role of active TB case finding using mobile units for early diagnosis of tuberculosis in Nigeria. The international Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, 11, 22.

[45] Sheahan, M., & Barrett, C. B. (2017). Food loss and waste in sub-Saharan Africa. Food Policy, 70, 1–12.

[46] Shukla, R., & Jharkharia, S. (2018). Agri-fresh produce supply chain management: A state-of-the-art literature review. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38(10), 2275–2304.

[47] Solomon, O., Odu, O., Amu, E., Solomon, O. A., Bamidele, J. O., & Parakoyi, B. D. (2018). Prevalence and risk factors of acute respiratory infection among under-fives in rural communities of Ekiti State, Nigeria. Global Journal of Medicine and Public Health, 7(1), 1–12.

[48] Tirado, M. C., Cohen, M. J., Aberman, N. L., Meerman, J., & Thompson, B. (2015). Addressing the challenges of climate change and bioenergy to food security and nutrition. Food Research International, 68, 1–10.

[49] Vermeulen, S. J., Campbell, B. M., & Ingram, J. S. I. (2012). Climate change and food systems. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 37, 195–222.

[50] Yaseen, M., Sun, D.-W., & Jabeen, A. (2018). Temperature-controlled storage using machine-learning algorithms. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 150, 353–366.