



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_61435
Title of the Manuscript:	A Strategic and Adaptive Plan for Resurgence of Food-Tech Delivery Service Sector During and Beyond Public Health Pandemic Crisis
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The systematic writing of articles is still not in accordance with journal writing rules.</b> In the journal should be more clarified: 1. INTRODUCTION, 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS, 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, 4. CONCLUSION, 5. COMPETING INTERESTS, 6. REFERENCES. The article that you made is not as detailed as what I meant above.</li> <li><b>The research background is still weak</b>, so there should be supporting data showing the conditions in India, especially in the Food Technology Delivery Service Sector During the Pandemic Crisis.</li> <li><b>Separate the research methodology with the research results, so that the analysis you make is clearer</b></li> <li><b>The analysis that you convey in the article is not yet strong</b>, so it needs a more detailed explanation of the object under study, it would be great if you added examples of cases that were happening in India during the pandemic.</li> <li><b>Conclusions are made more detailed and clear</b>, meaning that it is more focused on answering the problem formulations that you mentioned in the previous background, so that the objectives of your research can be clearly conveyed in this article.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Putu Nina Madiawati</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Telkom University, Indonesia</i></b>