

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_125876
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumer Preferences and Behavior: A Study on Nasi Goreng Mak Sutan at G-Town Square, Gading Serpong
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript explores consumer preferences in the culinary industry with a focus on Nasi Goreng Mak Sutan at G-Town Square. This study is important as it provides insights into consumer behavior, a key factor for sustaining competitive businesses in crowded markets. The research addresses practical business applications by recommending ways to improve food quality, pricing, ambiance, and service, which are crucial for boosting customer loyalty and overall business success. Such findings are valuable for culinary business owners and regional policymakers interested in promoting local food tourism.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is clear but could be slightly refined to emphasize the focus on the culinary aspect. A suggestion: "Understanding Consumer Preferences and Behavior in Culinary Choices: A Case Study of Nasi Goreng Mak Sutan at G-Town Square Gading Serpong." This enhances clarity by highlighting the research context and focus.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally clear, but a more explicit mention of key findings (e.g., average food quality, high price perception, the role of ambiance) would make it more informative. Adding specific data points or qualitative insights could improve its comprehensiveness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is logical and follows a clear flow from introduction to conclusions. However, the "Results" and "Discussion" sections could be separated for clarity. Additionally, expanding the "Limitations" section would strengthen the manuscript by acknowledging sample size restrictions more explicitly.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study is scientifically sound and follows established qualitative research methodologies. The use of purposive sampling and semi-structured interviews is appropriate for exploring consumer preferences in a specific culinary setting. However, the sample size of 30 participants is relatively small, and future research could benefit from a larger sample to enhance generalizability. Overall, the manuscript is technically robust, and the findings align with existing literature on consumer behavior.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are relevant and recent, with an adequate mix of foundational and contemporary sources. However, additional references on the specific influence of price sensitivity on culinary choices could add depth to the pricing discussion. Studies such as those focusing on behavioral economics in food markets could be integrated.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Language Quality: The manuscript is written in clear English, but there are some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that should be addressed. For example, in the abstract, the phrase <i>"The ambiance is considered comfortable, and the service needs a improvement"</i> should be revised to <i>"The ambiance is considered comfortable, but the service requires improvement."</i> A thorough proofreading will help refine the text for scholarly communication. Methodology Transparency: While the methodology is sound, it would benefit from a more detailed explanation of how participants were selected for the study (i.e., what criteria were used for "frequent visitors"). Additionally, further elaboration on the data analysis process (coding) could add transparency to the qualitative analysis. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Including some visual data presentations (such as charts or tables that summarize the qualitative findings) could improve the manuscript's readability and impact. The "Conclusion" could be strengthened by including a clear, actionable recommendation for policymakers or local businesses. Highlighting how businesses can adapt based on consumer preferences would make the research more applicable <p>The manuscript is scientifically sound and provides useful insights for the culinary industry, though some revisions are needed to improve clarity, generalizability, and language quality.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mohd Irfan Rais</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Oman College of Management & Technology, Oman</p>