

Author Dashboard

7 Manuscripts with Decisions

Start New Submission

5 Most Recent E-mails

Manuscripts with Decisions

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
Forms Completion submitted (05-Apr-2018) - view	EIC: Griffith, Christopher	BFJ-01-2018-0060.R1	Motivation-based segmentation of local food in urban cities: A decision segmentation analysis approach	03-Apr-2018	04-Apr-2018
	AE: Griffith, Christopher				
	EA: Griffith, Christopher				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Accept (04-Apr-2018)Published				
	view decision letter				
			View Submission		





ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
a revision has been submitted (BFJ-01-2018-0060.R1)	EIC: Griffith, Christopher AE: Griffith, Christopher EA: Griffith, Christopher EA: von Holy, Corene <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Revision (05-Mar-2018) a revision has been submitted 	BFJ-01-2018-0060	Motivation-based segmentation of local food in urban cities: A decision segmentation analysis approach	09-Feb-2018	05-Mar-2018
	view decision letter		View Submission		
Forms Completion submitted (23-Jan-2018) - view	EIC: Griffith, Christopher AE: Griffith, Christopher EA: Griffith, Christopher <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept (22-Jan-2018) Published 	BFJ-09-2017-0519.R1	Personal values underlying halal food consumption: evidence from Indonesia and Malaysia	19-Jan-2018	22-Jan-2018
	view decision letter		View Submission		
a revision has been submitted (BFJ-09-2017-0519.R1)	EIC: Griffith, Christopher AE: Griffith, Christopher EA: Griffith, Christopher <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Revision (25-Nov-2017) a revision has been submitted 	BFJ-09-2017-0519	Personal values underlying halal food consumption: Evidence from Indonesia and Malaysia	17-Sep-2017	25-Nov-2017
	view decision letter		View Submission		

ACTION	STATUS	ID	TITLE	SUBMITTED	DECISIONED
Forms Completion submitted (16-Jul-2013) - view	EIC: Griffith, Christopher AE: Not Assigned EA: Berry, Zoe	BFJ-04-2013-0083.R1	Exploring consumer motivations towards buying local fresh food products: a means-end chain approach <i>Files</i> <i>Archived</i> ?	10-Jul-2013	10-Jul-2013
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept (10-Jul-2013) <i>Archiving completed on 03-Sep-2016</i> vol:116, iss:10 view decision letter				
a revision has been submitted (BFJ-04-2013-0083.R1)	EIC: Griffith, Christopher AE: Not Assigned EA: Berry, Zoe	BFJ-04-2013-0083	Exploring consumer motivations towards buying local fresh food products: A Means-End Chain approach <i>Files</i> <i>Archived</i> ?	07-Apr-2013	28-May-2013
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor Revision (28-May-2013) a revision has been submitted <i>Archiving completed on 03-Sep-2016</i> view decision letter				
	EIC: Griffith, Christopher AE: Not Assigned EA: Berry, Zoe	BFJ-Feb-2012-0041	Perspectives on Consumer Perceptions of Local foods in Indonesia <i>Files</i> <i>Archived</i> ?	28-Feb-2012	05-Mar-2012
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject (05-Mar-2012) <i>Archiving completed on 14-Jun-2012</i> view decision letter				

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

ScholarOne Manuscripts and ScholarOne are registered trademarks of ScholarOne, Inc.

ScholarOne Manuscripts Patents #7,257,767 and #7,263,655.

 @ScholarOneNews |  System Requirements |  Privacy Statement |  Terms of Use

British Food Journal

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?](https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=55f91fa003f647378967768a82e69b69)
URL_MASK=55f91fa003f647378967768a82e69b69

Date Sent: 05-Mar-2018

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

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-01-2018-0060.R1)

From: cgriffith@cardiffmet.ac.uk

To: poppy74arsil@gmail.com, poppy.arsil@unsoed.ac.id, elton.li@gmail.com,
johan.bruwer@unisa.edu.au, jdwb77@gmail.com,
graham.lyons@adelaide.edu.au

CC:

Subject: British Food Journal - Decision on BFJ-01-2018-0060.R1

Body: 04-Apr-2018

Dear Dr. Arsil:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Motivation-based segmentation of local food in urban cities: A decision segmentation analysis approach" in its current form for publication in British Food Journal.

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: 04-Apr-2018

 Close Window

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

British Food Journal

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?](https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=e42588b60da94724be55b90578d6ad01)
[URL_MASK=e42588b60da94724be55b90578d6ad01](https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=e42588b60da94724be55b90578d6ad01)

Date Sent: 25-Nov-2017

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

 Close Window

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

British Food Journal

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**

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-04-2013-0083)**From:** cgriffith@uwic.ac.uk**To:** poppy.arsil@adelaide.edu.au, poppy_arsil2003@yahoo.com**CC:****Subject:** British Food Journal - Decision on Manuscript ID BFJ-04-2013-0083**Body:** 28-May-2013

Dear Mrs. Arsil:

Manuscript ID BFJ-04-2013-0083 entitled "Exploring consumer motivations towards buying local fresh food products: A Means-End Chain 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 minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <http://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@uwic.ac.uk

DEADLINE: 26-Aug-2013

Reviewer(s)' comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

This is an interesting application of means-end analysis.

I suggest a few modifications to the structure of the manuscript to improve flow of ideas and readability.

The introduction as it is now structured has much in common with the literature review and the material from the introduction can be rightly paced in the review of the literature pertaining to the local food system. The introduction can then be used to set the context of the study, to introduce the food system literature and to introduce and justify the method and the sampling procedure (from pages 6 and 7).

Specific comments relating to the introduction and literature review:

- Additional references. For example, the first sentence 'Support for the local-food movement...
- Additional examples. Sentence two of the introduction, for example, 'Many countries...
- Definitions for local food and its derivatives and explanation of terms such as 'particular place' on page 2.

Please clarify the research questions, in particular what you hope to learn about the decision making behaviour of urban and rural Javanese residents.

The contention that there may be greater variety of foodstuffs when local producers are encouraged is correct but counter intuitive and this point would benefit from a brief discussion.

Grammatical:

The manuscript could benefit from a general edit to improve readability and correct spelling and grammatical errors. For example:

- The sentence containing 'reassert farm control...' on page 4 should refer to managerial control or simply leave out the word 'farm'.
- Remove 'a' after ... had lowered... on page 9
- Remove 'the' in the sentence. Tempeh... on page 15
- The sentence 'The personal values emerged...' on page 7 is awkward and a little difficult to follow.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The study builds on a number of others that report similar findings. This work adds to that body of knowledge by including information from a large population that is underrepresented in similar studies.

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 relevant literature on the use of means-end chain analysis is

referenced and covered adequately and the author justifies its choice as a methodology. The literature on local food is relevant but limited. This section could be expanded with a comparable reduction in volume devoted to methodology. There is a need for definitions in the introduction and the literature review of terms essential to the development of the argument and the research questions. Specifically, this includes terms such as; local food, local food systems, local food policy and local food diversification and should be accompanied by supporting references.

I suggest some modifications and rearrangement to the introduction and the literature review. Some of the specifics of which are repeated in my 'Comments to the Author'.

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?: This section is well done. The discussion of means-end analysis was adequately referenced and discussed. However, I suggest that parts of section 2.2 particularly the first and third paragraphs are better placed in section 3 as the discussion directly relates to methods.

This section could be tightened up with a more concise discussion of sampling. Also, the theoretical discussion of the Hierarchy Value Map is better placed in this section rather than the results section.

The research questions could be placed in a separate section and a brief discussion of the linkage to the literature review included.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Reporting of results starting with Section 4.2.1 is adequate, tables are a welcome addition and the accompanying explanation is appropriate. Discussion is clear and concise despite the occasional grammatical error. I suggest a schematic may also increase the readability of the 'pathways' discussion on page 14. Section 4.1 and 4.2 would be better placed in the 'Methods' section.

Section 4.3 'Discussion' is well done. Section 5 'Conclusions', however, is not adequate. The author needs to extract more meaningful conclusions from the discussion in-order to establish the contribution to new and significant information that is required to warrant publication. Similarly the study's limitations could also include a brief statement of limitations arising from the sampling procedure and the methodology replacing that discussion found now in Section 4.1.

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 implications for policy and practice are the strongest reasons for encouraging publication of this paper. The study has the potential to influence policy and to encourage further research in the area.


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.: There are a number of grammatical and sentence structure issues. Notably the first of the two research questions would benefit from a rewrite for clarification. Attributes, for example, are not generally considered 'achievable'. It appears that the research is looking at the decision making process of rural and urban residents and the attributes that are identified in this decision making process.

To go straight to your paper click this link:

[http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?](http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=TTwcPScYXZy2jS2Jn83C)
[URL_MASK=TTwcPScYXZy2jS2Jn83C](http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bfj?URL_MASK=TTwcPScYXZy2jS2Jn83C)

Date Sent: 28-May-2013

File 1: * How-to-submit-a-revision.doc

 Close Window

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-04-2013-0083.R1)**From:** cgriffith@uwic.ac.uk**To:** poppy.arsil@adelaide.edu.au, poppy_arsil2003@yahoo.com,
elton.li@adelaide.edu.au, johan.bruwer@unisa.edu.au,
jdw77@gmail.com, graham.lyons@adelaide.edu.au**CC:****Subject:** British Food Journal - Decision on Manuscript ID BFJ-04-2013-0083.R1**Body:** 10-Jul-2013

Dear Mrs. Arsil:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Exploring consumer motivations towards buying local fresh food products: A Means-End Chain approach" in its current form for publication in British Food Journal.

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 note, EarlyCite is not a proofing service. Emerald operates a 'right first time' policy, which means that the final version of the article which has been accepted by the Editor will be the published version. We cannot allow further changes to the article once it has been accepted.

Please go to your Author Centre on ScholarOne Manuscripts (Manuscripts with Decisions/Manuscripts I have co-authored) to complete the copyright assignment form. We cannot publish your paper without the copyright form. All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details, to ensure that a complimentary journal copy can be despatched upon publication. If you have provided full contact information in the completed copyright form your journal copy should arrive within 8 weeks of print publication.

If you would like more information about Emerald's copyright policy please visit the Instructions & Forms section in the Resources section of your Author Centre.

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

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@uwic.ac.uk

Date Sent: 10-Jul-2013

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.

British Food Journal

Decision Letter (BFJ-Feb-2012-0041)**From:** cgriffith@uwic.ac.uk**To:** poppy.arsil@adelaide.edu.au, poppy_arsil2003@yahoo.com**CC:****Subject:** British Food Journal - Decision on Manuscript ID BFJ-Feb-2012-0041**Body:** 05-Mar-2012

Dear Mrs. Arsil:

I write you in regards to manuscript # BFJ-Feb-2012-0041 entitled "Perspectives on Consumer Perceptions of Local foods in Indonesia" which you submitted to the British Food Journal.


The British Food Journal has over the past 24 months experienced a significant increase in the number of papers it receives for possible publication. In spite of increasing the number of papers in each issue we currently receive far more papers than can be published, even allowing for the normal paper rejection rate, and as a consequence the editorial board has decided to concentrate on those papers of maximum interest to its subscribers. One of the editors has looked at your paper and decided that it would have only limited appeal, and therefore on this occasion we will not be considering it further for publication.

We realise this must be disappointing for you and stress this is not a reflection of the academic merit of the paper which we suggest you submit for publication in another journal.

Thank you for submitting your paper for consideration by the journal and we hope you will consider us for submission in the future.

Regards,

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

Date Sent: 05-Mar-2012 Close Window

© Clarivate Analytics | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2019. All Rights Reserved.