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Thank you for inviting me as one of the reviewers.

It is an interesting topic that focuses on food delivery platforms in Taiwan. However, there are several key issues need to be addresses before it can be published.

1. **Inappropriate positioning of the manuscript:** I was quite confused while reading through this manuscript until I found your research context is Taiwan. And based on my knowledge, food delivery platform has already gained widespread attention among researchers, many has focused on consumer perception, for example, Chen et.al., 2020, PANSE et.al., 2019. Therefore I assume new context is one of your research contribution. Hence, it is suggested that you can add Taiwan in your title, abstract and contribution. Moreover, there is a lot of repetition in the background, motivation, research purpose and research contribution, problem statement, so maybe you can rewrite and put them together.

2. **Lack of theoretical foundation:** In your literature review, they are all ‘definition of mobile commerce’ or ‘description of food delivery platform’ or ‘development status of food delivery platforms in Taiwan’ instead of ‘theories and literatures’. On the positive side, it is good to provide a very comprehensive research background. On the negative side, you do not provide a literature review from an academic perspective, nor do you provide the theory to guide your research. You may consider rewrite this section.

3. **Methodological issues:** I find several issues in this part. First, why use these eight items in questionnaire for understanding consumers’ perspectives on the usability and functionality? Is it from literature or from prior interviews? Second, it is recommended that sample sizes and demographic descriptions be reported in tabular form. Third, a stronger statistical analysis method is needed to generate results.

4. **Insufficient result, discussion, conclusion:** The discussion and conclusion section need to be detailed, with a comparison to other studies. And you need to emphasize research theoretical contribution, not just practical implications.

Overall, I feel this work to be more of an industrial survey than a research paper.