

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_128222
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing the Impact of Infrastructure, Corporate Involvement, Financing, and Conservation on the Success of the National Strategic Food Estate Project in Siria-Ria Village, Pollung District, Indonesia
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The subject is of enduring importance because the human race must eat! Secondly, the development matrix is predicated upon the improvement of the vulnerable. Therefore, studies emanating at grassroots provide microscopic data for hard to reach yet significant populations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, it is not. The title leads a reader to expect much more than what the article actually delivers. The word analysing invokes detail, comparisons and trend analyses. An alternative title could be:  An Overview of Infrastructure, Corporate Involvement, Financing, and Conservation to the National Strategic Food Estate Project in Siria-Ria Village, Pollung District, Indonesia	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I suggest that the abstract state the total number of respondents from the start. This gives sharper context. Abstract just says 50, raising the question: "out of how many?" until page 3.</li> <li>The author states the SEM &amp; PLS revealed results on infrastructure and financing. The expectation is to hear all 4 hallmarks referred to. Unfortunately, author breaks this stream of thought. The author must move results of SEM &amp; PLS up next to those of infrastructure and financing for comprehensive writing.</li> <li>It would be best to give brief definitions of key words within the context of the paper.</li> <li>Certain acronyms RPJMN are not defined. If PSN is translates to National Strategic Food Estate Project, then this should also be explained at the beginning.</li> </ul>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No comment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No comment.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is satisfactory. There is room for improvement to break long winding sentences into two (eg the second paragraph from For instance up to Tiuma et al). Still language is satisfactory.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of depth and anecdote is the most pervasive weakness of this paper. Examples which are mentioned are sweeping and lack detail. For instance on the Pemantang and Medan as well as the paragraphs about Subulussalam City and Bireuen Regency. On page 4 the phrase “more efficiently.” is not supported with evidence. Same applies to modern technologies, corporate involvement and conservation on page 5.</b></li> <li>• <b>What evidences that there was an improvement? Hence, metrics such as the income figures, tonnes of harvest, volumes of transactions or any relevant quantification would make the report more convincing.</b></li> <li>• <b>Examples should cite the before situation, the intervention and the after situation, with measureable outcomes.</b></li> <li>• <b>Finally, the disaster risks of Kisaran City, how community involvement could mitigate those disasters and its relevance to the topic are not clear. The author may consider deleting reference to Kisaran City.</b></li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Rudo Mabel Kurebwa</b></p>
<p><b>Department, University &amp; Country</b></p>	<p><b>Arthur Portland College, Botswana</b></p>