

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_122853
Title of the Manuscript:	Cross-generational analysis of consumer behaviour towards convenience foods
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript uses a quantitative analysis method to explore the different preferences for convenience foods among generations and the reasons for the differences through specific data. This will be helpful for the future development of the convenience food market. It can also better explore the differences in eating habits between different age groups based on generational differences.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ① There are unexplained significant differences in the manuscript, which require further explanation and discussion. When explaining the differences, reference can be made to past studies to explain the reasons for the differences. ② The abstract of the manuscript mentions that it can provide suggestions for the market competitiveness of convenience foods. However, there is no detailed discussion section in the manuscript. Does it provide some suggestions for increasing the competitiveness of convenience foods through discussion? ③ There are different reference names in the manuscript. It is recommended to use the unified Gen X, Gen Y, and Gen Z for reference. ④ Where does the indicator system analysed in the manuscript come from? Is it necessary to explain the reasons for the selection of each factor? 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, and it is recommended to increase the Discussion section.	
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.	The manuscript is appropriate to conduct preliminary statistical analysis based on the collected primary data and to prepare for the next detailed analysis. The conclusion of the manuscript reveals the different levels and reasons for the preference for convenience foods among generations, so the statistical results are appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are references from 2006 in the references. Should similar authoritative research from recent years be selected to replace them?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is written in fluent language, but still requires polishing.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ziteng Shi
Department, University & Country	China