



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19479
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Business Image Improvement and Quality of Products of Meatballs Household Business and Catering</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

**PART 2:**

<b>FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)</b>	<b>Authors' response to final evaluator's comments</b>
<p>Overall, this article still does not meet the standards required for publication. Not many improvements that have been made since the previous comments. The main drawback of this article is on the method and findings. If opportunities were given to the author, the correction needs to be made in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two methods used need are lacking the details. For the mentoring &amp; coaching, it is remaining unknown who are the mentor, how many of them, how long is the mentoring &amp; coaching, etc. As for the survey – it is not clear the purpose of the survey, the items included in the survey, example of items asked, etc.</li> <li>• Lines 144-145: information about the size of sample for both types of business need to be placed and elaborated in the method. Anyway, this information is contrast with the information in the method - 100 respondents OR 100 customers of catering and 100 customers of meatballs???</li> <li>• Line 151: All of a sudden, the author used the word “merger” - whether the merger is a method used in the study? No information is given.</li> <li>• The differences among portions of the pie charts are not clear.</li> <li>• It is not clear the effects of training on consumptions.</li> <li>• There should be two separate findings for the two types of businesses.</li> <li>• Lines 232-233: “the activities had been shown to result in improving the business productivity” - need to provide evidences.</li> <li>• Line 268: “Revenue increased to 70%....” this is new information and nothing was mentioned about this earlier. A conclusion should not include any new information.</li> <li>• The review of literature is still not adequate.</li> <li>• The references are not updated. Make sure all citations are listed in references.</li> </ul>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Shaiful Annuar Khalid</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Faculty of Business Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Perlis, Malaysia</i></b>