

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_98431
Title of the Manuscript:	Culinary Business plan and Marketing Mix Strategy: A final report
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:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. This manuscript does not meet the scientific criteria, and thus, is not important for the scientific community 2. OK 3. An abstract is not an introduction. It is a short summary of the entire research paper which highlights key content areas (including methods of research), research purpose, the relevance or importance of the work, and the main outcomes. Please improve the abstract of the article. 4. This manuscript does not reach the level of a scientific article and needs to be improved to be considered for the journal 5. This manuscript is not a scientific article, but rather an assignment given to students to complete grading requirements. Does not meet the minimum criteria of a scientific article. 6. Only 4 references are referred to in this manuscript. inadequate for a scientific article 7. There are many grammatical errors here and there throughout the manuscript. 8. Spelling mistakes should be avoided. 9. Are there decimal points for the number of students (Table 1)? 10. Many words for example 'practical and affordable' are used repeatedly in a sub-segment which makes reading not enjoyable. Sub-section 2.1 should be improved further. 11. The author needs to know the objective(s) of his writing and state it clearly. Refer to the article(s) in the related field and see how: writing style, citations, discussion of findings of previous studies, support statements and findings, discussion etc. 12. Proofread the manuscript	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Need to proofread the manuscript	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ainon Ramli
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia