

# Review of: "Rush Farming of Konjac (*Amorphophallus Muelleri*) Among Novice Farmers In West Java, Indonesia: A Descriptive Study"

L.L.G. Maxime

Potential competing interests: Not competing interests

## Title

- The proposed title is not consistent with the text. Therefore, authors should review this title. For example, in the text, the authors mention that for konjac, the men are the farmers and the women are the traders. In addition, the seed companies are mentioned there.
- Why mention "Jelegong" throughout the text but not in the title?
- The authors can, in their search for a title consistent with the text, be inspired by this: "itinerary of *Amorphophallus Muelleri* (konjac) in West Java for sustainable conservation and valorization of the plant in Indonesia" Indeed, from a title like this, readers will understand that there is a lack of information about the itinerary of the plant. Moreover, that there is a problem of conservation and valorization of the plant in Indonesia
- In "itinerary" will be included: harvesting, seeds, marketing, state and levels of conservation, government measures, domestication techniques, etc.

## Abstract

- The problem is not clearly stated. For example, what problem do the authors ultimately want to solve, provide one or more solutions?
- What is the goal? Or, the research question? Or the research hypothesis?
- What do the authors conclude in accordance with the objective? Or, the research question? Or the research hypothesis?

## Material and methods

### Methods

- In the method, the authors do not specify what is the period (months) of cultivation or that of harvesting the plant (or whether it grows naturally). This information helps to understand why the study was only carried out in two months. Hence the question why only the months of May and June for data collection?
- The survey sheets (questionnaires) are missing in the appendix. They would have allowed readers to differentiate

between qualitative and quantitative data.

- What were the criteria for choosing the informants (those who answered the questions)?
- The NAGOYA protocol is not taken into account, in particular so that local populations have access to benefit sharing (APA) from the study. This is a hindrance for the manuscript. In this regard, how do the authors intend to resolve this shortcoming?
- On what basis did the authors select or retain the 37 informants (producers, etc.) for the study? In other words, what were the producers' selection criteria? Or, what were the inclusion criteria and the exclusion criteria?
- Why the authors don't talk about informed consent form for each informant?

## Results and discussions

### 1. Characteristics of Konjac producers

- Were the ages assessed in days, months or years? Hence, specify in brackets the unit of assessment: ages (days), ages (months) or ages (years)
- There are no half-ages from which to round "42.24" to "42". Do the same for "experience in non-konjac agriculture"
- Generally, the results are presented either in the form of a table or in the form of figures (histogram, pie charts, diagrams, etc.) Presented in this way, all the information is included. The objective of presenting them in this way (figures and/or tables) is that the authors do not comment on what the readers do not see. For example, the author's state that "men work more in the field while women market more konjac" This should show up in a table or figure.

This leads to the following question: how many men and how many women were there among the 37 informants? In principle, the answer to this question should be contained in a table or a figure. Therefore, Table 1 presented by the authors is incomplete. In reality, all the characteristics the authors talk about should be visible in the same table (Table 1).

- In discussion, authors should be careful when using conditional verbs. Because these are interpretations that may not be verified.

### 2. Process of domestication of konjac

- If the authors mention the domestication of konjac, this may reflect that the plant is threatened with extinction in its natural environment. The question is: what does the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) say about the status of konjac?
- The authors mention figures without citing the sources. This is not scientifically correct.

### 3. Local government response to the konjac phenomenon

- Why do the authors claim that konjac is a phenomenon?

- The authors state that “the increasing number of novice farmers growing konjac is a positive phenomenon”. How this was “positive” assessed?
- The authors talk about food security. Food security is defined by three essential factors: availability of food; food accessibility and food utilization. Hence, the question: does the konjac whose domestication is still in progress respond to these 3 factors?

**NB.** The other sub-parts of the results and discussions must obey the same remarks

## **Conclusion**

The conclusion must be made either according to the objective(s) set at the start, or according to the research hypothesis or even according to the research question.