

Korespondensi

Decision Letter (BFJ-09-2017-0519)

From: cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

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

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-09-2017-0519

Body: 25-Nov-2017

Dear Dr. Arsil:

Manuscript ID BFJ-09-2017-0519 entitled "Personal values underlying halal food consumption: Evidence from Indonesia and Malaysia" 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 MAJOR revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond FULLY to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Please explain how you have responded to the reviewers' comments

Emerald has partnered with Peerwith to provide authors with expert editorial support, including language editing and translation, visuals, and consulting. If your article had revisions requested on the basis of the language or clarity of communication, you might benefit from a Peerwith expert's input. For a full list of Peerwith services, visit: <https://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/>
Please note that there is no obligation to use Peerwith 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. Christopher Griffith
Editor, British Food Journal
cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

DEADLINE: 23-Feb-2018

Reviewer(s)' and comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

Dear Author,

I think your research is interesting and timely. These are the major points of improvement I would suggest:

- connecting the literature review to the research question and the case study at hand
- going into more depth in the analysis and presentation of results
- clear recommendations for the government and the agricultural sector
- English proofread and precision of arguments

Additional Questions:

1. **Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Generally, I find the research topic timely and interesting, especially since the global halal food market is steadily growing and Malaysia is developing into a global halal hub. The analysis brings up some new insights that might be worthwhile publishing.

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 author cites some interesting research from Western Europe. However, (s)he does not succeed in contextualizing this literature and critically evaluating it in the light of her/his own research taking place in Indonesia/Malaysia. It might also be useful to look into research done by John Fischer on the topic. I think that page 3 line 24 cannot be generalized ("halal food certifications exceeds Islamic religious obligation.")

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?: It might be useful to mention that a constructivist lens has been chosen and why. Moreover, I miss a justification of the choice for Malaysia and Indonesia. Furthermore, I doubt if the capital cities are representative for the countries at large. This might need some rephrasing. The author does not do anything with the demographic data in table 1. What do these results mean for the representativeness of the research? The mean-end approach is well-chosen, but could be explained more clearly. Personally, I have no experience with the laddering method, but it seems comprehensible to me.

4. **Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are presented in an understandable manner. However, I believe that there is more in the data (as shown in the table), than what is being discussed in the results section. Schwartz's theory comes a bit out of the blue and needs to be better embedded with the results found in this research.

Page 8 line 33-47 seems to belong into the literature review section, though.

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?: In the introduction, the author explains the relevance of the research results for government and the agricultural industry. Yet, the recommendations resulting from the research are rather vague. I think the results allow for more concrete suggestions.

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.: While there is a clear structure of the paper, the language used needs to be revisited. English proofreading and a critical view on the structure of the arguments would help the readability of the paper.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

Extend discussion on Implication of Research. The findings shows many relevant parties can benefit from this research. Thus it needs to be clearly highlighted.

Additional Questions:

1. **Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Interesting research topic and relevant to current scenario. Author is able to provide current and significant information which is adequate to justify 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?: Literature is clearly written from a general view of Halal food, model used. However, author is recommended to extend the explanation of personal values attributes using current references to add value to the literature discussion. This reflect the objective of the study which is to uncover personal values driving consumption decisions with respect to halal food.

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?: Theory used (MEC) is described clearly. Face to face interview is found to be a suitable data collection method supporting the theory applied in this study. Good justification given for the respondents chosen and development of scales. Summary implication matrix (SIM) and hierarchical value map (HVM) is appropriately been used and explained.

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 analysed and presented. The conclusions adequately discussed in relation to the objective. Tables presented summarised clearly from the analysis output.

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 paper did identify the implications of the research. However, it was too brief to be digested by the readers. A good study should possess high implications thus need to be clearly addressed. This section need further improvement as to discuss on the how the findings are different from theory, how relevant parties can benefit from the findings.


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.: This paper portrays a good quality of communication. The sentence structure is easily understood by readers.

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=e42588b60da94724be55b90578d6ad01

Date Sent: 25-Nov-2017

File 1: * [How-to-submit-a-revision.doc](#)

 Close Window

Decision Letter (BFJ-09-2017-0519.R1)

From: cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

To: poppy74arsil@gmail.com, poppy.arsil@unsoed.ac.id, tey@upm.edu.my, markbrin@chariot.net.au, pcunuei@gmail.com, denisaliana94@gmail.com

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-09-2017-0519.R1

Body: 22-Jan-2018

Dear Dr. Arsil:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Personal values underlying halal food consumption: Evidence from Indonesia and Malaysia" in its current form for publication in British Food Journal. The comments of the reviewer(s) who reviewed your manuscript are included at the foot of this letter.

By publishing in this journal, your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. This is a pre-publication service which allows your paper to be published online earlier, and so read by users and, potentially, cited earlier.

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 assignment form. 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 copyright form. If you would like more information about Emerald's copyright policy, please visit the Information & Forms section in your Author Centre.

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

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. Christopher Griffith
Editor, British Food Journal
cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Date Sent: 22-Jan-2018



Close Window

Decision Letter (BFJ-01-2018-0060)

From: cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

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

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-01-2018-0060

Body: 05-Mar-2018

Dear Dr. Arsil:

Manuscript ID BFJ-01-2018-0060 entitled "Motivation-based segmentation of local food in urban cities: A decision segmentation analysis approach" 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 MAJOR revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond FULLY to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Please explain your response to the reviewers comments

Emerald has partnered with Peerwith to provide authors with expert editorial support, including language editing and translation, visuals, and consulting. If your article had revisions requested on the basis of the language or clarity of communication, you might benefit from a Peerwith expert's input. For a full list of Peerwith services, visit:

<https://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/>

Please note that there is no obligation to use Peerwith 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. Christopher Griffith
Editor, British Food Journal
cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

DEADLINE: 04-Jun-2018

Reviewer(s)' and comments to Author:

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

You continuously mix the tenses without a reason, especially in the results section; decide on the use of past tense (easier) or present tense

- Second part of the sentence in page (p) 1, line (l) 33 is not hard to understand as well as the next sentence (for sure urban people can buy local food).
- p2, l3: Chambers et al. 2007 (not 2011)
- p2, l27: add more sources for WTP studies
- p4, l22: is instead of are
- p5, l13-17 and table 1: Compare your data with official statistics in these cities (if data is existent)
- p5, l24/25: delete a total of
- p6, l4 and l25: delete , after et al.
- p6, l17: determination of
- p8, l32: ... were food quality ...
- p9, l13: were identified
- p11, l16: different segments
- p15: in Table 1 the grouping of family income is a bit strange, if 83% belong to one group and the rest is divided in 4 groups - this does not make sense, also because you did not use the different income groups in the text.
- p15: Table 1: Money for food for family per week does not make sense, if you do not know the very different numbers of family members - calculate per capita
- Figure 1: Do not use abbreviation (HVM) in the headline of the Figure - all figures should be comprehensible without looking for abbreviations in the text.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: partly yes
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?: mainly yes; however, there are many more recently published studies on the willingness-to-pay for local food which provide important results for the discussion of the study's results (especially for the consumer segment "value for money").
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?: Methodology is fine, but not the description of the sampling procedure. Page 3 and again 12 list the three study cities which were chosen because of different ethnic background of the study population. If this ethnic reason is really important for the outcome of the study, then the researchers have to take care that only people of the different ethnic groups are interviewed in the three very big cities (it is not described how this was assured) and to check for differences in the results which was also not done. Why have they mentioned then the ethnic groups several times? Furthermore, it should be described how the "random sampling stage" of the sampling procedure was done.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Partly yes. However there are some important shortcomings. One is with mentioning the ethnic groups several times. If the authors expect differences they have to check their data for these differences which was obviously not done. Another shortcoming is the use of the term "health". It is fine with the description of results, as consumers think so. However, you cannot directly promote "health" as a reason to buy local food (see section Conclusions), if this is not proven. Why should a government argue with health reasons. There are many more reasons as freshness, support of the local economy etc. (see literature). The conclusions do not take into consideration that local food is perceived as good value for money - this does not automatically mean "cheaper" - the value(s) behind are important. This should be discussed in the conclusions together with several study results on the willingness-to-pay from other countries.
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?: partly yes, but discussion and conclusions must be better elaborated. So far, conclusions partly encompass repetitions of the introduction chapter (e.g. with ethnic groups).
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

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=55f91fa003f647378967768a82e69b69

Date Sent: 05-Mar-2018

File 1: * [How-to-submit-a-revision.doc](#)

 Close Window