

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFRN_122564</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FOOD SAFETY DESIRABILITY RESPONSE TOWARDS HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS OF COFFEE SHOP EMPLOYEES</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>This manuscript aimed to provide information about the knowledge Experience of coffee shop employees patterning to food safety by applying scoping appraisal components as independent variables and subsequently providing their behavioural intentions, based on the Protective Motivation Theory.</p> <p>But I dislike the manuscript because in the conceptual framework, the scoping appraisal components, which are the independent variables, were not properly utilized or stated. Also the dependent variables outcome were not well stated (which should be either poor hygiene practices or good hygiene practices Intentions)</p> <p>NOTE: Knowledge Experience → Coping Appraisal (Response Efficacy, Self-Efficacy, Response Cost) → Behaviour Intentions</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>No, the title is not suitable. It should be "Protection Motivation Theory to foretell desire of coffee shop employees to take part in protective behavior against food risk based on the coping appraisal component"</p> <p>Alternatively, the title can be stated as "Coping Appraisal to foretell desire of coffee shop employees in taking part in protective behaviour against food risk"</p> <p>NOTE: The opposite of food safety is food risk.</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 not comprehensive. It should precisely and concisely state the Background, Methodology, Result, Conclusion, and Recommendation.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No, some subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate.</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 manuscript is not scientifically correct; therefore, it is not scientifically robust and sound.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, they are recent and adequate. However, I suggest they add more that are contrarily or in favour of their findings.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arhyel Buba Mshelia</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Maiduguri, Nigeria</b>