

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130007
Title of the Manuscript:	SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT FOR SAGO NOODLE PRODUCT IN THE CEMPAKA HEALTHY NOODLE BUSINESS
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the marketing efficiency and supply chain management of Cempaka Healthy Noodle's sago noodle product, offering significant implications for the scientific community. By analyzing the supply chain stages, from raw material sourcing to final consumer delivery, the study identifies critical points where efficiency can be improved.	Ok
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title "SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT FOR SAGO NOODLE PRODUCT IN THE CEMPAKA HEALTHY NOODLE BUSINESS" is generally suitable, as it clearly reflects the focus of the study on supply chain management for a specific product (sago noodles) in a defined business (Cempaka Healthy Noodle). However, it could be refined slightly for clarity and conciseness. For example, you might consider revising it to:</p> <p>"Supply Chain Management of Sago Noodle Production in Cempaka Healthy Noodle Business"</p>	<p>Ok. We are willing to revise the title, according to the reviewer's suggestions.</p> <p>Supply Chain Management of Sago Noodle Production in Cempaka Healthy Noodle Business</p>
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved by briefly mentioning the research objectives, methodology (SCOR analysis), and key findings (performance score of 35.430). Redundant details, such as specific distributor names, could be removed for conciseness.	Ok. The abstract has been revised according to the reviewer's suggestions.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct in its approach, methodology, and analysis. It clearly outlines the importance of sago as a food resource and its potential for development, particularly in the context of Cempaka Healthy Noodle. The use of SCOR analysis for evaluating supply chain performance is well-justified, and the calculation of performance indicators is appropriately detailed. The survey method, purposive sampling, and data processing methods are clearly explained.	ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Majority of the references are recent. I have no comments of amendments.	ok

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the manuscript could be improved for scholarly communication. Some sentences are long and complex, which may reduce clarity. For example, the sentence "Sago plants are a traditional food staple in Indonesia, commonly consumed in forms such as papeda, sinole, and sago lempeng (Timisela, 2006)" could be simplified to "Sago plants are a traditional food staple in Indonesia, consumed in forms like papeda, sinole, and sago lempeng (Timisela, 2006)." There are also grammatical issues, such as missing articles ("the") and inconsistent verb tenses. For instance, "This study adopted the survey method, which uses critical observation to obtain clear information on a particular problem" could be revised to "This study employed a survey method, using critical observation to obtain detailed information on a specific problem."	Ok. Improvements as per reviewer's suggestions. Sago plants are a traditional food staple in Indonesia, consumed in forms like papeda, sinole, and sago lempeng (Timisela, 2006). This study employed a survey method, using critical observation to obtain detailed information on a specific problem
Optional/General comments	I did not get plagiarized contents. No competing interest No ethical issues are observed.	ok

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	