



**Peer-Review Report Form**

|                          |                                                                             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Manuscript Title:</b> | Withering Fields: Voices of Loss, Adaptation, and Hope among Banana Farmers |
| <b>Type of Article:</b>  | Original Article                                                            |

**FIRST ROUND**

**Editor**

| <b><u>General Comments and Recommendations</u></b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations. |

**Reviewer 1**

| <b><u>General Comments and Recommendations</u></b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The manuscript discusses an important and relevant issue, especially for banana farmers who face market instability, diseases, and environmental risks. The topic has value, but the paper still needs stronger organization and clearer academic presentation before it can be considered for publication. |

| <b><u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u></b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The Results section needs major revision because many parts are written as personal reflections of the researcher, such as "I felt" and "I realized." This weakens the objectivity of the findings. The results should focus more on the participants' voices, clear themes, and direct evidence from the data.                                                         |
| The methodology needs more detail on how the interviews and focus group discussions were conducted. The paper should explain the number of IDI and FGD participants, how long the sessions took, how data saturation was determined, and how translation from the local language was handled. These details are important for judging the trustworthiness of the study. |



The discussion is repetitive and sometimes does not clearly explain how the findings connect with the cited literature. Some claims of agreement or contradiction with previous studies need deeper explanation. The authors should avoid simply saying that the findings support or contradict a study without explaining why.

The recommendation for future quantitative studies, including SEM and EFA, is interesting but not strongly connected to the present qualitative findings. The authors should first clarify the practical implications of the current study for farmers, cooperatives, and government agencies before moving to future statistical research.

**Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.**

| <u><b>Decision</b></u> |                                                                                                                                          |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                        | Accept the manuscript for publication.                                                                                                   |
| /                      | Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. |
|                        | Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.                                                                            |

**Reviewer 2**

| <u><b>General Comments and Recommendations</b></u>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Thank you for the opportunity to read your manuscript. I am reading your work with much interest. The topic about banana farmers fighting against market instability, extreme weather, and banana diseases is very timely and important. You really captured the hard realities of their livelihoods.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <u><b>Specific Comments and Recommendations</b></u>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Your abstract mentions employing a predictive research design and developing survey instruments with Exploratory Factor Analysis. This is very strange for an abstract of a qualitative study. An abstract should only summarize the exact study you did, not your recommendations for future quantitative studies. Please remove these future methodology parts and give more space to explain the actual themes you found from the 12 banana farmers.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| You stated that you utilized a qualitative descriptive research design to provide a detailed summary of the participants' perceptions. In the Ethical Considerations, you cited the trustworthiness criteria of Lincoln and Guba (2009). But when I check your References section, Lincoln and Guba is listed as published in 1985. You must fix this year mismatch in your citations.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| In the results, because you used a qualitative descriptive design, the focus should be strictly on the voices of the farmers. But you are writing with too much heavy emotion about yourself. For example, in Theme 3.8, you wrote: "A profound sense of emotional collapsed overwhelmed me as I reflected on moments when financial strain reached its breaking point". In Theme 3.10, you even wrote: "At a certain point, I felt the weight of reality pressing heavily on me as I faced the truth that the farm, I once depended on could no longer function...". Are you also one of the banana farmers? If you are just the researcher, you cannot say "the farm I once depended on." You must remove these overly dramatic personal reflections because it makes the paper look |



like an auto-ethnography instead of a descriptive study. Let the quotes of the farmers speak for themselves.

In the discussion, under the heading "Absorption Capacity", you have a paragraph starting with "The finding of my study asserted that banana farmers exhibited absorptive capacity...". Then immediately after, you pasted almost the exact same paragraph again, starting with "The findings of the study indicate that banana farmers exhibit absorptive capacity...". This exact same duplication mistake happens again under the "Restorative Capacity" section. You repeated the paragraph discussing the findings of Molde (2025) and Wulandari et al. (2023) twice. You strictly need to delete these duplicate paragraphs to clean up the manuscript.

Your recommendation suggests using Structural Equation Modeling and Exploratory Factor Analysis. It is okay to suggest these quantitative tools for future researchers. But please, you must also provide practical recommendations that directly help the farmers or local government agencies right now, based on your findings about farm rehabilitation and market connections.

**Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.**

| <u>Decision</u> |                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                 | Accept the manuscript for publication.                                                                                                   |
| /               | Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. |
|                 | Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.                                                                            |

**SECOND ROUND**

| <u>Decision</u>                                                                                                                          | <u>Editor</u> | <u>Reviewer<br/>1</u> | <u>Reviewer<br/>2</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Accept the manuscript for publication.                                                                                                   | /             | /                     | /                     |
| Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. |               |                       |                       |
| Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.                                                                            |               |                       |                       |