

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_89037
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the consumers' perception towards street foods in Anand – Vidhyanagar
Type of the 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p><b>The English needs serious editing; there are too many errors.</b></p> <p><b>The study says it is descriptive in the introduction; but it presents the data as if there has been serious and deep analysis, which has not occurred. I suggest adding a bit more information about the purpose of the survey: to describe the consumers' preferences....not to analyze WHY the choose to buy and eat street foods. The paper itself seems to wobble a bit back and forth from the description and data to the "analysis" ...which is basically a quantitative description of the results of the survey.</b></p> <p><b>The conclusion states:</b> Information generated from this study may assist regulatory authorities with regard to policy and approaches to street food vendors.</p> <p>I wonder whether the data resulting from this study can really influence policy or approaches to the vendors...the data and the description only present numbers, and it's not clear how those will or could influence policy. The description is of consumers' perceptions...but we hear that the consumers continue to eat the food despite the potential disease and lack of cleanliness...those two issues seem contradictory and not able to convey clearly how they would affect policy.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Focus on the report/paper as a description of the quantity of responses...NOT as an analysis. More people like panipuri...that's it. Or X number believe the vendors might carry disease...that's it. But the paper also states in some places and infers in others that there has been analysis...NO, there has been accounting and reporting. So stick to that, please, and focus on the description. But, do more studies and find out WHY those numbers are as they are.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This study is descriptive of the consumers' perceptions (self-reported on a survey that produced quantitative data that was counted) rather than being seriously analytical (e.g., determining WHY some foods are preferred and by whom, why there are contradictions between perceptions (food choice/cleanliness/continued purchasing). As such, it shows that panipuri is the most popular street food in Anand, and for good reasons: cheap, tasty, easy to make and eat out of hand, etc. And it is readily available, which seems to be a major attraction of street food everywhere. And the local people like the taste, which is a major preferential reason (but some details are lacking...what about the taste of which type of panipuri is the allure, for example; or do the consumers continue to buy from the same vendors consistently, etc.). The description is interesting, and the survey n is large enough to give a good quantitative sample; but I always want to know the reasons why consumers make their choices, at the most detailed level. That is missing and could be the topic of future research.</p> <p>The authors do a good job of informing the reader about the dangers involved in street food: uneducated vendors/food preparers, food preparation and storage (temperature, etc.), and many other sanitation issues that are of grave importance. Younger, female, nuclear family members with higher education seem to notice the disease issue more than others who were surveyed. But that difference disappears when the participants were asked about food safety regulations. That's also interesting; why is there a difference? I would like to see some serious analysis re. why those people are more aware than the others about certain factors. But the data describe, and this is a descriptive study. The authors can do much more analysis of this topic.</p> <p>And the data are very interesting: the consumers seem to include every income and age group (a very wide demographic), and all seem to agree generally on the type of food they prefer and all seem to be at least somewhat concerned with the cleanliness/sanitation...but they keep buying the street food. That is also interesting and could be the topic of further analysis: why do you keep eating this street food when you know it's not clean or that you may get sick?</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Also, do the consumers always or nearly always buy from the same vendors, and why? And though the authors provide the data on media use and the knowledge of licensing, regulations, food types and sources, etc., there is no real analysis...just description.</p> <p>So, my comment generally refers to the type of study...it is descriptive, and it is tantalizing...I want to know WHY these data/results of the survey are as they are. Let's see another study that asks WHY, and that perhaps includes the vendors...we hear of their general education and lack of regulatory adherence, but who are they, what are they making, how does the food selling influence their lives, and more. As a big fan of street food everywhere, I'm curious about the underlying reasons for the popularity and uses, and the preparation and sales, of street food.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b><u>Name:</u></b>	Anne Bliss
<b><u>Department, University &amp; Country</u></b>	Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile