



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39621
Title of the Manuscript:	Feasibility and economic risk of programmed pruning cycle in Arabica coffee
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	The introduction lacks the background information on the programmed pruning. It is to be very clear to the reader to understand it. Specifying Monte Carlo method applied Reviewing some of variables in sensitivity analysis eg land, land price cannot be specific to type of pruning. Description of Sources of data is lumpy and not transparent. The author has not explained how it was possible to figure out the duration of the pruning The description of risk analysis is somehow redundant. The author could be able of generating NPV-CDF without undertaking economic analysis of important variables as per the explanation made. Consider recasting or to be matched in explanation on how to conduct NPV. It is explained that the risk analysis of important of variables were done but the results presented is for NPV. What was the role of such analysis? For improved analysis the author may refer to the dominant procedures for assessing the analysis. The author may review: Richardson, J.W., K.D. Schumann, and P.A. Feldman.2008. <i>Simetar: Simulation and Econo-metrics to Analyze Risk</i>. Simetar Inc, College Station, TX. Justification of the importance of this study is somehow not justifiable. ``The second management refers to the programmed pruning cycle for Arabic coffee, in which the plants are renewed without zero harvest. Renewals, in this case, occur after the 7th, 14th and 21st years``. It is very hard to continue undertakings without understanding its economic viability for such long time. Otherwise the author must specify that the study applied ante evaluation. If it is ex-post, then the justification is not justifiable. As it is indicated in the discussion, the traditional pruning is rated at 3.6% while the programmed is 15.3% yet the later has the higher NPV. If it is true, then the authors must recheck the background and the justification. The different is too huge to enable every farmer to shift to the programmed pruning. Provide the clarity on the subject matter. Data to be included in cash flow are known. The author explains about ``cash flows technical coefficients``. What are these coefficients? What were the sources of these coefficients? Which methodology(ies) applied to compute these coefficients? The author must explain this clearly. The author must sure the term economic feasibility and economic viability are linked well.	
Minor REVISION comments	English language must be maintained throughout Consider to delete justification of the study in the abstract Explanation on why decided to ``an unfavorable 10% variation`` in sensitivity analysis is required. Why 10% and why unfavorable? The author has to use the same discount rate to compare the performance of the systems to make easy comparison. In the discussion, the author must show the link between NPV and IRR, why the author used the same value; 3.61 and 15-30% to explain both indicators? This might bring problems to some readers.	
Optional/General comments	Much of the references are not in English making hard to follow	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rogers Andrew
Department, University & Country	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania