Author Dashboard

11 Manuscripts with Decisions

Start New Submission

5 Most Recent E-mails

Manuscripts with Decisions

Items per page: 10 1 - 10 of 11

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
Forms Completion submitted (07-Nov-2021) - view	EIC: Bresciani, Stefano AE: Carolan, Michael EA: BAIMA, GABRIELE • Accept (07-Nov-2021) *Archiving completed on 08-Dec-2021* view decision letter Contact Journal	BFJ-05-2021-0605.R2	Determinants of consumers' motivation towards Padang ethnic food: Evidence from Indonesia *Files Archived*	07-Nov-2021	07-Nov-2021

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
a revision has been submitted (BFJ-05-2021-0605.R2)	EIC: Bresciani, Stefano AE: Carolan, Michael EA: BAIMA, GABRIELE • Minor Revision (24-Oct-2021) • a revision has been submitted *Archiving completed on 08-Dec-2021* view decision letter Contact Journal	BFJ-05-2021-0605.R1	Determinants of consumers' motivation towards Padang ethnic food: Evidence from Indonesia *Files Archived*	18-Sep-2021	24-Oct-2021
a revision has been submitted (BFJ-05-2021-0605.R1)	EIC: Bresciani, Stefano AE: Carolan, Michael EA: BAIMA, GABRIELE • Major Revision (15-Jul-2021) • a revision has been submitted *Archiving completed on 08-Dec-2021* view decision letter Contact Journal	BFJ-05-2021-0605	Determinants of consumers' motivation towards Padang ethnic food: Evidence from Indonesia *Files Archived*	31-May-2021	15-Jul-2021
	EIC: Bresciani, Stefano AE: Not Assigned EA: BAIMA, GABRIELE • Reject - Inappropriate *Archiving completed on 11-Aug-2021* view decision letter Contact Journal	BFJ-04-2021-0439	Determinants of consumer motivation towards Padang ethnic food in accordance with people's origin *Files Archived*	23-Apr-2021	29-Apr-2021

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-05-2021-0605.R2)

From: michael.carolan@colostate.edu

To: poppy.arsil@unsoed.ac.id, poppy74arsil@gmail.com, danglehoa@hcmuaf.edu.vn, danglehoa@yahoo.com, rumpoko.wicaksono@unsoed.ac.id, afik.hardanto@unsoed.ac.id

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-05-2021-0605.R2

Body: 07-Nov-2021

Dear Arsil, Poppy; Dang, Hoa; Wicaksono, Rumpoko; Hardanto, Afik

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript BFJ-05-2021-0605.R2, entitled "Determinants of consumers' motivation towards Padang ethnic food: Evidence from Indonesia" in its current form for publication in British Food Journal. Please note, no further changes can be made to your manuscript.

Please go to your Author Centre at https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj (Manuscripts with Decisions for the submitting author or Manuscripts I have co-authored for all listed co-authors) to complete the Copyright Transfer Agreement form (CTA). We cannot publish your paper without this.

All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details. If any of the contact information is incorrect you can update it by clicking on your name at the top right of the screen. Please note that this must be done prior to you submitting your CTA.

If you have an ORCID please check your account details to ensure that your ORCID is validated.

By publishing in this journal your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. As soon as your CTA is completed your manuscript will pass to Emerald's Content Management department and be processed for EarlyCite publication. EarlyCite is the author proofed, typeset version of record, fully citable by DOI. The EarlyCite article sits outside of a journal issue and is paginated in isolation. The EarlyCite article will be collated into a journal issue according to the journals' publication schedule.

FOR OPEN ACCESS AUTHORS: Please note if you have indicated that you would like to publish your article as Open Access via Emerald's Gold Open Access route, you are required to complete a Creative Commons Attribution Licence - CCBY 4.0 (in place of the standard copyright assignment form referenced above). You will receive a follow up email within the next 30 days with a link to the CCBY licence and information regarding payment of the Article Processing Charge. If you have indicated that you might be eligible for a prepaid APC voucher, you will also be informed at this point if a voucher is available to you (for more information on APC vouchers please see http://www.emeraldpublishing.com/oapartnerships

Thank you for your contribution. On behalf of the Editors of British Food Journal, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Yours sincerely,
Prof. Michael Carolan
Editor, British Food Journal
michael.carolan@colostate.edu

Tell us how we're doing! We'd love to hear your feedback on the submission and review process to help us to continue to support your needs on the publishing journey.

Simply click this link https://eu.surveymonkey.com/r/F8GZ2XW to complete a short survey and as a thank you for taking part you have the option to be entered into a prize draw to win £100 in Amazon vouchers. To enter the prize draw you will need to provide your email address.

Date Sent: 07-Nov-2021

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-05-2021-0605.R1)

From: michael.carolan@colostate.edu

To: poppy74arsil@gmail.com, poppy.arsil@unsoed.ac.id

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-05-2021-0605.R1

Body: 24-Oct-2021

Dear Dr. Arsil:

Manuscript ID BFJ-05-2021-0605.R1 entitled "Determinants of consumers' motivation towards Padang ethnic food: Evidence from Indonesia" which you submitted to the British Food Journal, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation. If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/. Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

To revise your manuscript, log into https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the British Food Journal, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the British Food Journal and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,
Prof. Michael Carolan
Editor, British Food Journal
michael.carolan@colostate.edu

DEADLINE: 08-Nov-2021

Reviewer(s)' comments to Author:

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:
Most of my comments relate to the quality of communications and your attempts to address the reviewers' comments. I suggest that you have done the reviewers and the potential audience a disfavor by not taking the suggestions as seriously as should have been. Specifically, simply adding in a few unrelated sentences or paragraphs to the paper does little to raise the level of your work to meet requirements. In-fact quite the reverse. Your research has merit and should be published but for that to happen you need to take the review process seriously.

Additional Questions:
1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper does warrant publication. The conclusions have been marginally improved particularly in the policy area which is the main strength of the research.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The authors have taken the reviewers comments into consideration and added to the literature. However, as pointed out below the new additions to theory must be better understood and integrated into the paper.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The methodology section is well done, and the changes incorporated from the reviewers' comments add to this section.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: This section was well done.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: This section is improved but more could be done to explore the implications for marketing and avenues for development of policy.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Although the authors have made an attempt to address the reviewers' comments, my main concern is regarding the quality of communication. Unfortunately, the paper is less readable than the original version. The insertions are most annoying, they are simply inserted into the text seemingly to satisfy a reviewers' comment without either paragraph transitions or context (i.e., tied to the rest of the paper). Additionally, some insertions challenge the theoretical foundations of the theory cited.

For example, page 3 lines 105-113 'driving forces that drive people'. The authors' clearly need to revisit Maslow and restructure this insert. It is not possible to relate all that requires attention here except to point out that motivation as a concept seems misrepresented. At the very least there is a need to acknowledge that needs motivate drives. This paragraph is also an example of an insertion without connection or context. It seems to be a weak attempt to introduce the concept of Maslow's hierarchy. Following on this theme, this reviewer questions the assertion mentioned in lines 333-340 that somehow self-actualization can be reached by eating ethnic food.

Do you want credit for reviewing this manuscript in Publons? [what's this?]
By selecting "Yes" you are opting in to the Publons service and data about this review (including your name and the review itself) will be transferred to Publons. You may opt-out of this service at any time.: No

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:
please re-check the topic and country of origin of this researcher.
"We've added a study on Padang food undertaken by Indonesian researchers (Rahman and Luomala, 2020) that is related and of good quality. Please see P. 2 Line 77-80".

Perhaps it would be more interesting if this study also explained why respondents were selected from Minang and non-Minang people.

Additional Questions:
1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, The paper explores consumers' motivations and cognitive structure of Padang

food consumption.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The authors have cited the relevant literature.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The methodology adopted for this paper is appropriate

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: yes

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The theoretical implications of this paper do not clearly explain

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: In general, the paper is well structured and clearly written.

Do you want credit for reviewing this manuscript in Publons? [what's this?]
By selecting "Yes" you are opting in to the Publons service and data about this review (including your name and the review itself) will be transferred to Publons. You may opt-out of this service at any time.: Yes

To go straight to your paper click this link: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=0a89619562cf47c6ac861271e57ccc17

Date Sent: 24-Oct-2021

File 1: Author Due Date British Food Journal.ics

File 2: * How-to-submit-a-revision.doc

Close Window

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-05-2021-0605)

From: michael.carolan@colostate.edu

To: poppy74arsil@gmail.com, poppy.arsil@unsoed.ac.id

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-05-2021-0605

Body: 15-Jul-2021

Dear Dr. Arsil:

Manuscript ID BFJ-05-2021-0605 entitled "Determinants of consumers' motivation towards Padang ethnic food: Evidence from Indonesia" which you submitted to the British Food Journal, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended major revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation. If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/. Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

To revise your manuscript, log into https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the British Food Journal, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the British Food Journal and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,
Prof. Michael Carolan
Editor, British Food Journal
michael.carolan@colostate.edu

DEADLINE: 14-Oct-2021

Reviewer(s)' and comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:
1. In the introduction, it is necessary to add research that has been done by Indonesian authors related to this topic.
2. The author needs to explain the concept of consumer motivation in this manuscript
3. In the discussion section, it is necessary to explain the terms that emerged from the data analysis. In addition, the findings of the study need to be strengthened by previous research
4. in the reference section, several sources need to be translated into English.

Additional Questions:
1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, it does contain new and significant information.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: This paper aims to explore consumers' motivation for choosing Padang food among Minang and non-Minang respondents'. However, this manuscript does not explain the concept of consumer motivation. This paper states that there are no previous studies that examine consumer motivation for Padang food. It is necessary to complete this statement by adding literature that researchers from Indonesia have written.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are clearly presented in the paper. However, I do not find any explanation for terms like "continuing life," "happiness," unique taste," "habit," etc., in the discussion. In addition, it is necessary to add more previous research that strengthens the research findings.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: yes

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: yes

Do you want credit for reviewing this manuscript in Publons? [what's this?]
By selecting "Yes" you are opting in to the Publons service and data about this review (including your name and the review itself) will be transferred to Publons. You may opt-out of this service at any time.: Yes

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Reject

Comments:
Dear authors,
unfortunately, I needed to recommend „rejection" to the editor in chief.
Throughout your paper, you did not outline the new findings of your paper in direct comparison to the studies you cited. For a future submission, you should make sure to identify a research gap. Duplicating a paper one-to-one does not lead to a value-added and hence, to a publication in a highly ranked (peer-reviewed) journal, like the British Food Journal.

Moreover, the paper needs a clear structure, including a discussion of the main findings. Additionally, it would have been interesting to set the results into perspective. Not only with academic literature but also with the recent development of a pandemic.
Furthermore, the literature used was (mostly) outdated, the methodology needs to be described properly, some parts of the paper need to be re-written to improve understandability and the sample seems not representative.

All the best for future research!

Additional Questions:
1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Unfortunately, it seems as if the paper does not contain any new and significant information. Former studies are duplicated only in a different study environment, namely a specific region in Indonesia. Yet it is not transparent why this specific region in Indonesia is exceedingly interesting for doing research and in how far this paper provides any value-added.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The paper outlines the results of interesting and related literature. However, the authors of this study do not establish a connection between the different studies cited.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: On page 5, lines 14 - 38 the methodology used is described. This is a very brief and superficial description. As a consequence, the methodology is not outlined properly, and used abbreviations are not fully comprehensible and self-explanatory. Moreover, the literature used to "describe" the methodology is outdated.
However, the implementation of the method seems appropriate as the results of the study are in line with the findings of previous work.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results are described properly. This part of the section is, however, not really linked to the other parts of the paper. Moreover, the results are not reflected, set into perspective with literature or critically questioned at all. In fact, the discussion is missing in total.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: I cannot see any link between this paper and the practice and/or the society - at least this is not outlined in the paper.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The paper is well written with regard to language requirements.

Do you want credit for reviewing this manuscript in Publons? [what's this?]
By selecting "Yes" you are opting in to the Publons service and data about this review (including your name and the review itself) will be transferred to Publons. You may opt-out of this service at any time.: No

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:
This is a welcome addition to the literature exploring marketing issues around consumers' motivation for food choice. It would be interesting to see the authors develop the line of enquiry that would focus on the factors that are important to the tourism industry.

Additional Questions:
1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper is an extension of existing research studying similar issues. However, with revised and extended interpretation of the results the conclusions will offer enough additional material, particularly in terms of policy recommendations, to warrant publication.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Acculturation is mentioned 4 times in the paper but not defined or referenced in the literature. As this term is important enough to be part of the keywords it requires further discussion.

The literature review references Botschen et al. (1999) in terms of the discussion of attributes. Tying in a link to benefits with the existing discussion on attributes
would add depth to the literature review.

The section entitled Personal values and means-end chain analysis is informative though a little messy and difficult to follow. It contains the first reference to means-end and a comprehensive review of the extant literature but would benefit from organizing; perhaps presenting the attributes in tabular form to promote clarity. Distinguishing attributes from benefits, and instrumental and terminal values could be more clearly presented.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The study is an interesting application of means-end chain analysis. The use of soft laddering is an appropriate method for data gathering. However, there should be at least a brief preamble noting the advantages and disadvantages of soft and hard laddering with a justification for the choice included under

method on page 4. Means-end chain theory itself is not introduced until page 3.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results section was well done with appropriate cut-off of 5 for the two segments reported. Table 3 is arguably the most important feature of this section and is a welcome addition. The discussion, though adequate, again gets a little lost in the statistical representation.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The conclusions section shortchanges the results of the research in several ways. There are implications for policymakers and research that apply to the two groups studied. Conclusions should contain a summary of and by extension the implications of the dominant attributes for both Minang and non-Minang groups. There should be discussion of where the dominant attributes diverge and where there is overlap or commonalities.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The introduction is well written, concise and informative. It sets the context of the paper nicely. Attention has been paid to sentence structure, grammar, and jargon. Also, the paper is generally very readable and would be improved with the small suggestions regarding tables and other measures mentioned earlier to improve clarity. Generally, well done.

Do you want credit for reviewing this manuscript in Publons? [what's this?]
By selecting "Yes" you are opting in to the Publons service and data about this review (including your name and the review itself) will be transferred to Publons. You may opt-out of this service at any time.: No

To go straight to your paper click this link: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=dea6fb4a81dc440f99f33c9542fdcb6e

Date Sent: 15-Jul-2021

File 1: Author Due Date British Food Journal.ics

File 2: * How-to-submit-a-revision.doc

Close Window

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-04-2021-0439)

From: gabriele.baima@unito.it

To: poppy74arsil@gmail.com, poppy.arsil@unsoed.ac.id

CC:

Subject: Decision on Manuscript ID BFJ-04-2021-0439 - British Food Journal

Body: 29-Apr-2021

Dear Dr. Arsil,

I write you in regards to manuscript # BFJ-04-2021-0439 entitled "Determinants of consumer motivation towards Padang ethnic food in accordance with people's origin" which you submitted to the British Food Journal.

The editorial team feel that your manuscript is not suitable for consideration for publication in the British Food Journal due to the quality of the written English/clarity of communication. Please have your submission language edited and resubmit.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation. If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/. Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

Thank you for considering the British Food Journal for the publication of your research. I hope the outcome of this specific submission will not discourage you from the submission of future manuscripts.

Yours sincerely,
Gabriele Baima
British Food Journal Editorial Office
gabriele.baima@unito.it

Tell us how we're doing! We'd love to hear your feedback on the submission and review process to help us to continue to support your needs on the publishing journey.

Simply click this link https://eu.surveymonkey.com/r/F8BLGHH to complete a short survey and as a thank you for taking part you have the option to be entered into a prize draw to win £100 in Amazon vouchers. To enter the prize draw you will need to provide your email address.

Date Sent: 29-Apr-2021

Close Window