

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_110738
Title of the Manuscript:	Indonesian Coffee Development Path: Production and International Trade
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This study is potentially interesting to investigate Indonesia's position in the global market from the production stage to the trade of production products. This study provides some valuable conclusions.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes. However, this article needs a systematic review of the previous literature, and it is recommended that the author add this content.</p> <p>5. Yes, but this study methodology may be revised by taking, for some suggestions and questions, the following comments below:</p> <p>First, I agree the GL index is an appropriate method for evaluating Product differentiation analysis; however, there are still differences in the existing literature on the setting of parameter α; for example, Tampubolon and Nababan (2022) assume the threshold is 0.15. It is suggested that the author further explain why this threshold is adopted and whether it is more suitable for Indonesia's empirical analysis.</p> <p>Second, it is suggested the authors further illustrate the results of the GL index. For example. "The GL-Index value indicated that Indonesian coffee is highly favored in North America and Australia-New Zealand, less favored in ASEAN, and received different responses in Europe, Middle East, and East Asia"</p> <p>We know them, but we want to know why and how to promote Indonesian coffee to low-GL countries.</p> <p>Third, It is suggested the authors further discuss the determinants of coffee export or GL index, such as Eshetu and Goshu (2021)</p> <p>Finally, please discuss the study's limitations and provide a few agendas for future research. Specifically, the conclusion section should be enriched to be useful for the community of scholars.</p> <p>Minor comment:</p> <p>It suggests the authors check all formulas; for example, formula (3) should be $1-\alpha \leq \frac{UV_j^x}{UV_j^m} \leq 1+\alpha$</p> <p>Second, It is suggested that the authors restructure "INTRODUCTION".</p> <p>References</p> <p>1. Eshetu, F., & Goshu, D. (2021). Determinants of Ethiopian Coffee Exports to Its Major Trade Partners: A Dynamic Gravity Model Approach. <i>Foreign Trade Review</i>, 56(2), 185-196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0015732520976301</p> <p>2. Tampubolon, J. ., & Nababan, T. S. . (2022). ASEAN's Factory Economy in the Fourth Industrial Revolution Era. <i>Economy of Regions</i>, 18(1), 49–63. https://doi.org/10.17059/ekon.reg.2022-1-4</p> <p>6. Yes. This also suggests that the authors need to revise the reference style to follow the AJAEES style.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>The Authors avoided the literature review section because the manuscript would be too long. In the introduction section, the literature review (results of previous research) is condensed which is sourced from 28 references.</p> <p>Explanation has been added on p. 4, lines 155-159</p> <p>This aspect has been added as a future research agenda on p. 13, lines 335-348.</p> <p>It has also been added to the future research agenda that coffee needs to be treated like a branded product in the fashion world, where producers design products according to unique individual consumer taste profiles. The most appropriate approach for this is the peer-to-peer market.</p> <p>The typo has been corrected on p. 13, line 148</p> <p>Author maintains introduction section with condensed literature review (no restructuring that would add pages)</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This suggests that the study is enough to express their case clearly, such as the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership. The journal's reader could understand it.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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)	