



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 57824

Title: Constructs of Quality Cacao Produce: An alternative scale.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript addresses an important topic in cacao production by attempting to develop and validate a scale for assessing quality cacao production. The integration of technical and behavioural factors is a commendable approach. However, the manuscript contains substantial methodological inconsistencies, conceptual ambiguities, statistical reporting issues, and language problems that require Minor revision before publication.

Content and Originality

Strengths

- The study focuses on a relevant agricultural issue, particularly within the Philippine cacao industry.
- Development of a context-specific scale for cacao production quality has practical value.
- The integration of Quality Management Theory and Theory of Planned Behavior provides a potentially useful conceptual framework.

Concerns

- The novelty of the study is not sufficiently established. Similar factor-based assessments of agricultural production quality already exist.
- The distinction between "quality cacao production" and "quality cacao products" is unclear throughout the manuscript.
- Several extracted factors do not align conceptually with their item contents. For example:
 - Factor 2 (Post-Harvest Processing Techniques) includes items related to packaging, marketing, certification, and customer demand rather than post-harvest processing.
 - Factor 5 (Farmer's Socio-Economic Status) contains items related to pest monitoring and GAP compliance rather than socio-economic indicators.
 - Factor 7 (Health, Nutrition, and Growth) contains items concerning flavor blending and product appearance rather than health or nutrition.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Technical Quality

Minor Issues

1. Research Design Inconsistency

- The study is described as:
 - Quantitative non-experimental.
 - Sequential exploratory design.
 - Sequential explanatory mixed-methods design.
- These designs are different and create confusion regarding the actual methodology.

2. Sample Size and Sampling

- The sample size of 300 respondents is acceptable for EFA.
- However, purposive sampling limits generalizability.
- No justification for sample adequacy based on item-to-response ratio is provided.

3. Exploratory Factor Analysis

- KMO = 0.871 and Bartlett's Test are acceptable.
- However, only the scree plot was used to justify factor retention.
- Parallel analysis was not conducted.
- No communalities table is provided.
- No rotated component matrix is presented completely.

4. Variance Reporting Errors

- Table 2 contains serious numerical inconsistencies:
 - Third factor reported as 366.442% variance, which is impossible.
 - Several cumulative percentages appear incorrectly reported.
- These errors raise concerns regarding the accuracy of the statistical analysis.

5. Factor Structure Problems

- Some items appear under multiple factors.
- Item 45 appears in both Factor 1 and Factor 5.
- Cross-loading analysis is not reported.
- Theoretical justification for factor naming is weak.

6. Reliability

- Overall Cronbach's alpha (0.97) is reported.
- Reliability coefficients for each extracted factor are absent.
- Composite reliability and AVE are not reported.

7. Need for CFA

- Since a new scale is proposed, Confirmatory Factor Analysis should be conducted on an independent sample to validate the factor structure.

Language and Presentation

Minor Concerns

- The manuscript contains numerous grammatical, punctuation, and typographical errors.
- Several sentences are repetitive and difficult to understand.
- Inconsistent spacing appears throughout the manuscript.
- Examples:
 - "studyemployed"
 - "itemthatfailed"

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- "participants were selected using a purposive"
- "maintainable and quality-enhancing practices"

Recommendation

A thorough English language editing by a professional editor is strongly recommended.

Structure and Organization

Strengths

- The manuscript follows a conventional scientific structure.

Weaknesses

- Considerable repetition exists between:
 - Results and Discussion
 - Framework Development
 - Conclusion
- The Conclusion section largely repeats discussion points instead of summarizing key findings.
- Figure references are not sufficiently discussed.
- The conceptual framework requires clearer explanation before data analysis.

References and Citations

Strengths

- Recent literature (2023–2025) has been incorporated.

Concerns

1. Several references appear incomplete.
2. Reference formatting is inconsistent.
3. Some citations appear questionable or inadequately detailed.
4. URLs are improperly formatted.
5. Several references lack volume, issue, page numbers, or DOI information.
6. APA formatting is inconsistent throughout the reference list.

Recommendation

The reference section should be revised according to the target journal's citation style and verified carefully.

Overall Recommendation

The study addresses a relevant topic and has potential value for cacao production research. However, significant concerns exist regarding methodological consistency, factor interpretation, statistical reporting accuracy, and language quality. The manuscript requires substantial revision before it can be considered for publication.

Final Decision:

Minor Revision