Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_111000**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ANALYSIS OF LEADING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND THEIR ROLE IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NORTH TAPANULI REGENCY**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **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)**	1. I believe that the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It tried to show an analysis of flagship agricultural commodities and their contribution to regional development and identified prominent crops in the region. With some corrections and adjustments, I believe it can be a good contribution to science and practice. 2. The title is suitable and holds an overall idea about the study. 3. The abstract needs revision. It should clearly state the mythology used, including the study design and sample units. The conclusions are not well stated, and the recommendations lack clarity as well as comprehensiveness. 4. Structure and Subsections (a). ***Introduction***: It is well written in terms of providing details of the specific context (REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NORTH TAPANULI REGENCY). However, the author didn't use a general-to-specific approach to introducing and building the rationale for the study. In other words, the general context was not sufficiently presented, particularly the global perspective, then Indonesian and North Tapanuli Regency. Moreover, the rationale that triggered the study and the research gaps have not been well established. The literature used was also not recent. (b) ***Objective:*** The research objective is not properly stated in the manner that it encapsulates the overall aim(s) of the study. I suggest objectives should be separately stated in the manuscript following the introduction. (C) ***Methods/methodology***: (a) The study setting is not clearly described; (b) the study design and the reason for using it are not justified; (c) the sampling procedure is not well defined; (d) the data collection tools and instruments are not clear; (d) the analysis procedures are blurred; (e) validity and reliability are not addressed. Overall, significant changes are required to ensure the quality of the manuscript. (d) ***Analysis***: are very shallow, as the researcher often presents tables and says nothing (don't give meaning to the data). The researcher's efforts are very minimal in terms of sharing the implications and consulting various literature and studies that have been conducted in the area. Therefore, I could suggest that the researcher intensively review the literature and studies conducted in a similar context. (e) **Conclusion and recommendation:** The author(s) is suggested to be specific in concluding the	

	key issues based on the findings and recommend WHO should do WHAT in relation to addressing the problem. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but the aforementioned issues should be carefully addressed to maintain scientific rigour. (f) ***References*** are sufficient but not recent. However, there are several recent studies that can be referenced here to strengthen the arguments and supplement the key findings. The author(s) also advised to maintain the coherence and consistency of the idea flows, particularly in the background section.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The support of a professional language editor is essential for this manuscript so as to make it suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Teshale Tegene Toma**
Department, University & Country	**Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia**