

Strategic Agility: A Holistic Framework for Fresh Produce Supply Chain Disruptions

Review

The paper is well-structured, extensive and addresses an important problem. Basically, I would like to see this paper published in the Journal. I recommend the acceptance of the paper with revision. I hope that the authors can appreciate my comments proposed to enhance the quality of the paper and resubmit the revised version.

Comment 1: The authors should point out in the title that the paper is a review.

Comment 2: The English language of the manuscript needs to be checked. There are some grammatical mistakes in the paper.

Comment 3: The reference list should respect the journal style. References must be numbered in order of appearance in the text.

Comment 4: The authors should describe how the bibliographic search was carried out (e.g., keywords used to search articles, databases as Scopus or Web of Science, and so on).

Comment 5: In order to highlight the growing interest of the literature on this topic, a histogram graph representing the distribution of the number of published articles per year should be included.

Comment 6: The title includes the term “*Disruptions*”. A definition of *disruption* should be provided in the Introduction. I suggest referring to the following works:

- Corsini, R. R., Costa, A., Fichera, S., & Framinan, J. M. (2022). *A new data-driven framework to select the optimal replenishment strategy in complex supply chains*. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 55(10), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2022.09.590>
- Gao, S. Y., Simchi-Levi, D., Teo, C. P., & Yan, Z. (2019). *Disruption risk mitigation in supply chains: the risk exposure index revisited*. *Operations Research*, 67(3), 831-852. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2018.1776>

Comment 7: Please provide in the end of the Introduction some lines in which the structure of the paper is described. As for example: “The structure is the following. Section 2 deals with... Section 3 describes...” and so on.

Comment 8: Page 5. Please replace “Section 2.0” with “Section 2”.

Comment 9: Page 11. The authors report a long sentence of Yawson and Aguiar. It should be better to summarize the concept with different words.

Comment 10: Table 2 should be reported in page 12.

Comment 11: Some lines to summarize in brief the paper should be included in the first lines of Section 4. Furthermore, the authors should provide directions for future research.