

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126711
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE SUSTAINABILITY STATUS OF ARABICA COFFEE-BASED ECO-FARMING ON SEMBALUN'S DRYLANDS, EAST LOMBOK REGENCY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
:		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Summary This manuscript evaluates the sustainability status of eco-farming practices in Arabica coffee cultivation on drylands in Sembalun, East Lombok. The study employs a multi-dimensional approach to assess ecological, economic, socio-cultural, institutional, and technological factors, analyzing the impact of eco-farming on local agricultural sustainability. Findings suggest that while technology use is well-implemented, economic and institutional factors still require improvement.</p> <p>Review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significance and Originality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The topic is relevant due to growing interest in sustainable agricultural practices. The focus on Arabica coffee, particularly in dryland conditions, adds valuable insights, especially for other regions with similar environments. ○ The study's originality lies in applying Multi-Aspect Sustainability Analysis (MSA) with Exsimpro software, distinguishing it from previous research that often relies on Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS). 2. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The abstract succinctly presents the study's aims, methodology, findings, and conclusions. However, minor grammatical adjustments could improve clarity, such as rephrasing "identifie s" to "identifies." 3. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The introduction comprehensively covers the background, significance of Arabica coffee in Sembalun, and gaps in previous studies. The regional agricultural context is well-articulated, though the structure might benefit from a more concise section explaining specific research questions and their practical implications. 4. Materials and Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mixed-methods approach is appropriate, given the multi-dimensional evaluation. Sampling and data collection methods are clearly defined, though details on Exsimpro software's specific role and settings in MSA might enhance replicability. ○ Including visual aids, such as a flowchart of the methodology, would improve the reader's understanding. 5. Results and Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The results are presented logically, with each sustainability dimension discussed in depth. The interpretation of the MSA findings is insightful, highlighting strengths and weaknesses in each dimension. ○ For clarity, a more structured results section, perhaps with subheadings per sustainability dimension, might enhance readability. ○ The "Kite diagram" mentioned is not provided within the document, which could limit comprehension. Including all figures referenced in the discussion is recommended for a clearer presentation of findings. 6. Conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The conclusions are well-founded based on the results. However, it might be beneficial to reiterate the need for future studies or policy recommendations that could tackle the identified gaps in institutional support and economic competitiveness. 7. References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The references are current and relevant, though a closer examination of citation consistency (e.g., missing punctuation and capitalization in some citations) could improve the manuscript's polish. <p>Overall Evaluation This manuscript is a well-researched contribution to sustainable agriculture literature, particularly relevant for dryland regions focused on eco-friendly farming. Minor structural adjustments and clarity improvements, particularly in the methodology and results sections, would enhance its readability and impact. Additionally, ensuring all cited figures are included is necessary for a complete and accessible publication.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agnes V. Simamora
Department, University & Country	Universitas Nusa Cendana, Indonesia