

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_120144
Title of the Manuscript:	Opportunities and Constraints of Coffee Production in Southern Tigray, Ethiopia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	Yes. The study can be referred for evaluation of coffee landraces that were reported to be tolerant / resistant to biotic/abiotic stresses for coffee crop improvement. Further assessment can be aimed at technical feasibility and economic viability aspects of promoting (or otherwise) chat (<i>Catha edulis</i>). Because, it always beneficial to respect the wisdom of choices adopted by local farmers. Need for intervention of horticultural management i.e GAP for coffee cultivation in systematic manner had been clearly highlighted.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	While the title appears to be acceptably fine, another suggestion may be: "Opportunities and constraints of promoting coffee plantation in Southern Tigray, Ethiopia" Rationale for suggestion: Coffee plantation vis-à-vis chat cultivation appears to be a major focus. Farmers choice for cultivation rather than production of coffee beans is another factor. However, I left to the wisdom of the editorial board.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, with minor suggestions as provided in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	Yes, approach of the study is scientific adopting proven FGD and direct interviewing of farmers. Derivation of ranking was also mathematically referred. In addition, physical observations had been made as reflected from/in the result and discussion section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mode of citing references in body of the manuscript need to conform to Journal's guidelines. b. Orders on reference section had been needs re-arrangement. c. Differences in fonts were observed. d. FAO 2018, though listed in reference section, but not found citing in body. e. Workafes W, and Kassu K (2000) and <u>(Workafes and Kebede, 2000) were differently cited in body and reference section.</u> f. Need for some latest references especially production data was highlighted. g. 	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, with certain suggested omissions and commissions.	
Optional/General comments	The study is found to be an informative piece of work. It would be useful for those who are keen to study on different crops in other parts of the world.	

Review Form 1.8

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:	Nongthombam Devachandra
Department, University & Country	Central Agricultural University, India