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### Compulsory REVISION comments

1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?**  
   (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)
   
   **Reviewer’s comment:** Yes, the manuscript appears to hold significance for the scientific community due to its comprehensive analysis and strategic recommendations for the development of coffee farming in North Tapanuli Regency.
   
   **Author’s comment:** The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of coffee farming development in North Tapanuli Regency, integrating various methodologies and perspectives. However, it would benefit from further clarity in presenting certain data analysis methods and results. Additionally, incorporating a more robust discussion on potential limitations and practical implications would enhance the manuscript's scientific credibility. Overall, while comprehensive, refining certain sections and ensuring greater depth in discussing implications and limitations could strengthen its scientific validity.

2. **Is the title of the article suitable?**  
   (If not please suggest an alternative title)
   
   **Reviewer’s comment:**  
   2. seems fitting as it clearly identifies the focus of the article, which is the strategic planning for the advancement of coffee farming within the larger framework of regional development in Tapanuli Utara Regency.

3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?**
   
   **Reviewer’s comment:** The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study on coffee farming development in North Tapanuli Regency. It outlines the research methodology, key findings, identified districts for coffee farming, determining factors, development strategies, production forecasts, and recommendations.

4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?**
   
   **Reviewer’s comment:** The article structure appears robust, covering key aspects of coffee farming development in North Tapanuli Regency. However, some subsections might benefit from more concise summarization to maintain clarity and streamline the presentation of information.

5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**
   
   **Reviewer’s comment:**  
   5. The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of coffee farming development in North Tapanuli Regency, however, some subsections might benefit from concise language and emphasizing key points.

6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.**  
   (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)
   
   **Reviewer’s comment:**  
   6. The references are sufficient and recent. However, additional references could be provided to support the findings and discussions in the manuscript.

### Minor REVISION comments

1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**

   **Reviewer’s comment:** GOOD

### Optional/General comments

The article on planning for coffee farming in North Tapanuli Regency is comprehensive, but a few areas could be enhanced:

- **Abstract:** The abstract could be more concise. It briefly summarizes the methodology and findings, but it could provide a clearer snapshot of the key results and their implications.

- **Introduction:** The introduction delves into the broader concepts of regional development and development theories. While it provides context, it could be more focused on directly introducing the specific context of the study and the importance of coffee farming in North Tapanuli Regency.

- **Methodology:** The methodology section is detailed but could benefit from a more structured approach, breaking down the steps involved in the Location Quotient analysis, A’WOT matrix, and trend analysis with clearer subheadings for each method.

- **Result and Discussion:** The Location Quotient (LQ) analysis is detailed, providing specific values for various districts. However, the significance of these values or how they impact planning could be explained more explicitly.

- **Trend analysis forecasts coffee production, but it lacks discussion on potential limitations or factors that might influence these projections.**
The perceptions of various stakeholders regarding factors influencing coffee farming are insightful. However, a deeper analysis of these perceptions and potential conflicts or convergences could add depth to the discussion. The SWOT analysis is well-presented but could offer more actionable strategies derived from the matrix.

Conclusion: The conclusion effectively summarizes key findings but could emphasize actionable recommendations more prominently. It briefly touches on strategies but could expand on how these strategies could be implemented and their expected impacts.

Suggestions for improvement:
- Clarity and Conciseness: Focus on providing a clearer, more concise presentation of findings and their implications.
- Deeper Analysis: Delve deeper into stakeholder perceptions, discussing potential conflicts and common ground among various stakeholders.
- Actionable Recommendations: Offer more specific and actionable recommendations derived from the findings.
- Visual Aids: Consider using visual aids such as charts or graphs to illustrate key findings for better comprehension.

By enhancing these areas, the article could offer more targeted insights and actionable strategies for the development of coffee farming in North Tapanuli Regency.
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