

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_120701
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Food Service Industry in Central Taiwan
Type of the Article	Short 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The comparison between services provision in the food industry due to covid encounter is important. The examples from different countries and different food services sectors are still welcome in the literature. However, the review and evaluation needs to be made with an organised/logical approach. The in-depth interview is beneficial and contributory when it is conducted in a systematic way. Accordingly, the author(s) need to reconsider their approach. They first need to well define the current service provision strategies and indicate differences between restaurants interviewed in order to compare and evaluate the progresses.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title fits to the content. But the content provision needs to be revised to provide insights to researchers and sector.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract lacks information on the methodology, concrete objective of the research. Besides, the targeted country – Taiwan was not mentioned in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>As the paper continues with in-depth interview of restaurant representatives, the focused qualitative methodology might be explained with reference to the literature. Besides, there expected a comparison between restaurants/cuisines/service provision methods between those targeted venues. So, methodology and discussion sections can be reconsidered.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>In the content, I presume comparison between central kitchen and distribution from one centre to subcontractors/restaurant chains and customers via online delivery and individual preparation and service provision. But I am not sure about this emphasis. Because the follow-up is different. The restaurants selected and analysed seemed to be unique and they have no relevance to central kitchen organisation. The findings or inferences withdrawn from the interviews can be compared. This would help policy/service & marketing strategy proposals. Comparison and discussion of the inferences lack critically.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references seem to be adequate for the current status. However, as I suggest discussion of the findings, relevant case studies from other destinations of the world or evaluation of restaurant systems need to be visited through academic literature.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English use is adequate for the current version. English use proficiency needs to be maintained in revision.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs to be revised and resubmitted. In addition to detailing and comparing the in-depth interview results, some mixed strategies and policies can be suggested in the conclusion.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Figen Ceylan
Department, University & Country	Akdeniz University, Turkey