



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_62954
Title of the Manuscript:	Trigona Honey home industry development for economic recovery In the time of Covid 19 pandemic (A case study in North Lombok West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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	<p>This paper try to investigate the best strategy to make business scale of trigona honey and community income increase, using the SAST and AHP methods. This is an interesting paper but need some revisions before publication as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraphs 4 and 5 in the introduction part are repetitive, so delete one of them 2. The style of references is not correct like [2][5], it should be changed to [2-5]. 3. In the methodology section, it is mentioned that using Decision Matrix (AHP) that is not correct abbreviation. 4. Figure 3 needs to be revised, the words in the circles are not shown correctly. 5. I suggest designing a better schematic view of trigona honey supply chain instead of using figure 3. I suggest reading the following paper to modify their figure. It can be considered the transportation and logistics components in the chain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zahraee, S. M., Shiwakoti, N., & Stasinopoulos, P. (2020). Biomass supply chain environmental and socio-economic analysis: 40-Years comprehensive review of methods, decision issues, sustainability challenges, and the way forward. <i>Biomass and Bioenergy</i>, 142, 105777. 6. The authors claimed that 'Based on the discussion with the experts', but they have not mentioned about the details of experts regarding their interview data collection or so on. This is an empirical research, but the data collection section has not provided and discussed well and enough. It is necessary for this kind of research to provide all the evidence and clarify the approach to obtain the results. 7. The authors applied the AHP method, but they have not clarified the software or tool to achieve the AHP results. It is common the using AHP and some more results can be added and discuss to rank and prioritize the factors. 8. The Methodology section is weak and needs to add some subsections to clarify Both suggested methods. 9. I suggest the authors to divide the Methodology into four sub section (Case study, Data collection, SAST, and AHP) 10. A discussion part is needed to highlight the managerial implication of this results and generalize their suggested approach for similar case studies in the world especially in this situation due to COVID-19. 11. All the abbreviations should be defined in the first tine of using in the manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Seyed Mojib Zahraee
Department, University & Country	RMIT University, Australia