

Restaurant Menus That Learn What You Like

Generated March 17, 2026

Restaurant Menus That Learn What You Like: Investment-Grade Market Research Report

Date: March 17, 2026 Subject: Product-Market Fit Assessment — Personalized QR Menu Platform (Restaurant SaaS) Classification: Investment-Grade Research Briefing — Confidential

1. Executive Summary

The restaurant technology market is experiencing a paradox that creates a precise and exploitable wedge opportunity. Three-quarters of restaurants globally have adopted QR code menus (TableQR, 2025), yet 81% of U.S. diners still prefer a physical menu over a QR code (TableQR, 2025), and only 1% rate QR codes as their favorite menu format. The market has digitized the menu without improving it. What exists is a static PDF behind a scannable square — the weakest possible expression of what a digital menu could be. The concept under evaluation, a QR-code menu platform that learns diner preferences, surfaces personalized recommendations, hides irrelevant items, and delivers dish-level analytics to restaurant operators, represents the intelligence layer this infrastructure has been waiting for. No direct competitor offering the complete feature set — cross-restaurant food profiles, real-time preference learning, dynamic pricing, and 86'd-item automation, all accessible without an app download — was identified in research covering the full competitive landscape. That absence is simultaneously the most compelling signal in this report and the most important risk factor: either the market is genuinely unbuilt at scale, or the category is too nascent to attract venture-grade scrutiny.

The addressable market is substantial and accelerating. The restaurant management software market is valued at USD 6.54 billion globally in 2025, projected to reach USD 14.73 billion by 2031 at a 14.52% compound annual growth rate (Mordor Intelligence, 2025). A bottom-up analysis of U.S. restaurant counts and realistic per-location pricing for a standalone menu intelligence tool yields a Serviceable Addressable Market of USD 178 million to USD 536 million annually, with a Total Addressable Market approaching USD 900 million to USD 2.4 billion depending on penetration assumptions. The AI-driven menu optimization segment specifically reached USD 1.18 billion in 2024, projected to grow at 19.7% CAGR through 2033 (Milagro Corp, 2025). Revenue tailwinds are confirmed across multiple independent market sources. Diner-side demand for personalization is equally documented: 83% of consumers are receptive to personalized restaurant experiences, while only 44% feel they currently receive relevant offers (QSR Magazine, citing PYMNTS research).

However, the viability assessment is not unconditional. Three structural risks temper the opportunity: a regulatory environment that is actively hostile to the precise features this platform offers, particularly personalized algorithmic pricing and cross-venue data profiling; a restaurant operator base with catastrophically thin margins that has historically churned SaaS tools at rates consistent with the lowest-performing ACV tier; and a technical dependency on browser-based diner identification without an app install, which creates a data persistence and consent architecture problem that no existing search result fully resolves. The overall verdict is a strong conditional opportunity — strong because the market gap is real, documented, and unoccupied at scale; conditional because execution must navigate a dense regulatory thicket before the dynamic pricing feature is deployed in any state with active algorithmic pricing legislation, and because the go-to-market strategy must prioritize multi-unit fast-casual operators over independents as the first commercial beachhead.

2. Market Sizing

Total Addressable Market

Establishing a defensible TAM for this platform requires triangulating between top-down industry reports and a bottom-up construction from restaurant unit economics. The divergence between these methodologies is instructive and demands that founders avoid the common mistake of citing the largest available market figure.

Top-down figures for the restaurant management software market range from USD 5.64 billion (Straits Research, 2024) to USD 6.54 billion (Mordor Intelligence, 2025) for the current global market, growing to USD 14.73 billion by 2031 at 14.52% CAGR. The restaurant digitization solutions market specifically is forecast to increase by USD 6.89 billion at a 16.81% CAGR between 2023 and 2028 (Technavio, 2025). Investment bank HL's restaurant technology market update pegs the global restaurant software market at approximately USD 6.6 to USD 7.0 billion in 2024 at a 17% CAGR through 2033. A broader "restaurant tech" figure of USD 59.3 billion (Restroworks, 2025) should be set aside entirely for this analysis — it incorporates payments processing, hardware infrastructure, and delivery logistics, none of which this platform addresses.

The most rigorous publicly available bottom-up estimate comes from AGC Partners, an investment bank specializing in restaurant technology, which constructs a U.S. restaurant software TAM of USD 16 to USD 32 billion, explicitly noting that vendor-reported TAMs of USD 50 to USD 170 billion are inflated by overly generous total addressable assumptions. Founders should treat AGC's figure as the outer bound for the entire restaurant software stack, and therefore allocate a proportional slice of it to a single-module menu intelligence tool.

A first-principles bottom-up construction using publicly available data is more useful for product positioning. The U.S. restaurant count is approximately 749,404 locations using the National Restaurant Association's 2023 figure (lineup.ai, 2024), or approximately 762,000 using AGC Partners' 2024 estimate. Toast, as a public company benchmark, reports approximately USD 629 million in annualized software revenues from 106,000 restaurant subscribers, implying an ARPU of approximately USD 5,934 per year per restaurant, or roughly USD 495 per month (Reforming Retail, 2024). That ARPU spans Toast's full suite — POS, analytics, marketing, and ordering modules — so a standalone menu personalization and intelligence tool should command a meaningful fraction of that spend. At a pricing range of USD 99 to USD 199 per month per location, three TAM scenarios emerge:

Scenario	Restaurant Universe	Monthly ARPU	Annual TAM
Conservative	749,000	\$50	\$449M
Mid	749,000	\$100	\$899M
Aggressive	1,000,000	\$200	\$2.4B

The mid-scenario USD 899 million figure is the most defensible single-point TAM for a standalone restaurant menu intelligence SaaS in the U.S. market, assuming broad eventual penetration of the full restaurant universe at a price point comparable to category peers.

Serviceable Addressable Market

The SAM should be constrained to restaurants that already have a demonstrated propensity to pay for digital menu infrastructure and analytics, and where the personalization value proposition is strongest — specifically, establishments with meaningful repeat customer traffic. The most relevant population is independent and small-chain full-service restaurants (approximately 150,100 single-location full-service plus technology-forward fast-casual independents per Toast's 2024 segment data) and small multi-unit operators already running at least one SaaS tool back-of-house. Toast's 106,000 paying software subscribers serve as a natural proxy for "restaurants already conditioned to pay for restaurant tech SaaS" (Reforming Retail, 2024).

Applying the same USD 99 to USD 149 per month ARPU assumption to an estimated 150,000 to 300,000 U.S. locations produces a SAM of USD 178 million to USD 536 million annually. This is the realistic near-term market for a product that has not yet achieved broad enterprise distribution. The technology intent signals within the operator base are encouraging: 76% of operators believe technology gives them a competitive edge, only 13% are satisfied with their current tools, and 76% expect to increase technology spend in 2024 (Restroworks, 2025; HL Investment Bank, 2024).

3. Competitive Landscape

Market Structure Overview

The competitive landscape for this platform spans four distinct categories: direct AI-personalization competitors that approach the full feature set; static QR menu platforms that represent the incumbent infrastructure; large POS systems that hold the data but have not built the intelligence layer; and adjacent emerging players solving isolated components. The critical finding, which underpins the market gap analysis in the next section, is that no single competitor in any of these categories combines cross-restaurant diner preference learning, real-time 86'd-item management, dynamic pricing for slow movers, and frictionless QR access without an app install.

Feature Comparison Matrix

Company	Diner Preference Learning	Cross-Restaurant Profile	Dynamic Pricing	86 Integration	No-App QR Access	Dish Analytics
Magic AI / Loyalist	Partial (staff CRM)	No	No	No	No	Partial
Juicer	No	No	Yes (delivery only)	No	No	No
Slang AI	No	No	No	No	No	No
Toast	No	No	No	Partial	Yes	Yes (operator-facing)
Square for Restaurants	No	No	No	No	Yes	Basic
OpenTable	Partial (reservation data)	No	No	No	No	No
QRCodeKIT (Cleo)	Partial (session AI)	No	No	No	Yes	No
menumiz	No	No	No	Partial	Yes	Basic
My Menu	Partial (loyalty integration)	No	No	No	Yes	No
TableQR	No	No	No	No	Yes	No

Company	Diner Preference Learning	Cross-Restaurant Profile	Dynamic Pricing	86 Integration	No-App QR Access	Dish Analytics
Target Platform	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Closest Competitors in Detail

Magic AI's Loyalist product, which closed a USD 10 million seed round in approximately November 2025 led by Lerer Hippeau, Bling Capital, and Floodgate with Major Food Group as lead investor, is the most credentialed operator in the adjacent personalization space (The AI Insider, 2025). Loyalist reports revenue growing more than 10x in the past year and claims tens of millions of guest interactions annually representing over USD 2 billion in guest spend across hundreds of restaurants. The critical distinction is that Loyalist is a staff-facing CRM tool that aggregates reservations, POS, and social data to help servers deliver personalized service — it knows a guest's favorite booth or that they love chocolate cake, but this intelligence surfaces in a host's tablet, not in the diner's hand via a QR scan. There is no diner-facing menu, no cross-restaurant profile the diner controls, and no dynamic pricing described.

Juicer, a San Francisco-based startup that raised USD 5.3 million in seed funding led by York IE in April 2024, addresses the dynamic pricing component specifically, but exclusively for third-party delivery platforms such as DoorDash and Uber Eats (Restaurant Business Online, 2024). Juicer raises prices during peak demand and lowers them during slow periods using historical sales data — a genuine competitive reference point for the pricing feature, but with a fundamentally different customer context (off-premises delivery economics versus in-restaurant diner experience).

Slang AI's USD 36 million growth round signals strong investor conviction in restaurant AI broadly. Its "Superhost" product handles inbound phone reservations and inquiries with named clients including Texas de Brazil and Riot Hospitality Group (QSR Magazine, 2025). But this is a voice channel product operating before the diner arrives at the restaurant, with no menu or ordering functionality.

Among QR menu platforms, My Menu is the most sophisticated, offering AI-generated menu descriptions, video-based dish presentation (citing a 15% increase in customer spending), and external loyalty program integration with an Accor partnership in the Middle East and Africa market (mydigimenu.com). The loyalty integration is notable but explicitly external — there is no native cross-restaurant preference learning described. QRCodeKIT's "Cleo" AI assistant handles dietary questions and ordering flow within a single QR scan, representing the closest structural analog to the diner-facing intelligence layer of this concept, but no cross-restaurant profile or preference learning from past orders is described.

Toast's menu engineering reports identify high-profit and high-velocity items for operators, and its Mobile Order and Pay product enables QR ordering, but personalization is entirely operator-facing — which items to engineer and promote — not diner-facing. There is no evidence of Toast offering personalized menu surfacing based on individual diner history.

Failed and Distressed Companies

The research did not surface specific case studies of failed QR menu personalization startups, which represents a meaningful gap. However, several distress signals are worth noting. Mr Yum and Meandu, both Australian QR ordering platforms, are cited by competitor menumiz as suffering from "lacks native POS or kitchen integration" and requiring "manual order re-entry" (menumiz, 2025). This pattern — building a front-end QR experience without solving the POS integration problem — is the canonical failure mode for this category. Allset, which was a pre-order dining app that pivoted multiple times, is referenced obliquely in one source but without current operational detail. The absence of failure post-mortems in the research record likely reflects how nascent this specific category remains, not the absence of failure.

4. Market Gap Analysis

The Static PDF Problem Is Documented and Widespread

The core problem statement — that restaurants deployed digital menus post-COVID but left them as static PDFs — is confirmed by original user testimony and independent market research. A Hacker News user identified as thomascgalvin captured the frustration precisely in June 2021: "My big issue, which should be easily correctable, is that every menu QR code I've scanned results in a PDF that I have to download. Nobody wants PDFs... on a phone, PDFs are even worse. They're almost always sized for the desktop, which means you have to pinch and scroll to see anything." A second commenter on the same thread (jscheel) added: "It's also super fun to download a 45mb menu on your cellular data plan every time you want to look at the menu" (Hacker News, 2021). A Reddit user in r/restaurant, posting in 2025, described scanning a QR menu at a well-known provider in Sierra Leone and receiving "just a plain list of food names and prices. No images. No context. Nothing that answered basic questions. It made me wonder what problem digital menus are actually meant to fix if they copy the weakest parts of paper menus and drop the useful parts" (Reddit r/restaurant, 2025).

The PDF complaint is not merely a UX irritation — it has structural consequences. PDF menus are not indexed by search engines, meaning restaurant-specific dishes do not appear in queries like "pizza near me" (Reddit r/restaurant, 2025). PDF menus embedded as images cannot be read by screen readers, creating accessibility barriers for disabled diners (Embark Studio, 2025). These are systematic failures of the current QR menu ecosystem that an intelligent platform would eliminate as baseline behavior, before personalization is even introduced.

The Personalization Value Is Demonstrably Real

The most compelling single data point in this research is a restaurant operator's unsolicited testimony from Reddit r/restaurant in 2025. A Barcelona restaurant owner described adding dietary filters (vegan, gluten-free, halal, high-protein, allergen flags), nutritional information, and language translation to their digital menu: "Customers can now filter dishes by their dietary needs... and it also generates and shows full nutritional information on the dishes, which is something I never imagined would be so appreciated, guests often mention it... I never thought customers would thank me for the menu itself but it happens regularly now." This report is notable because the operator describes unsolicited positive customer feedback for features that current platforms do not offer at scale — a strong signal of genuine unmet need rather than speculative demand.

The cross-restaurant profile concept has an analogous proof point in the Beli app, which builds a cross-venue "Taste Profile" for diners and makes scored recommendations based on past restaurant behavior. Beli users report it changing how they evaluate restaurants in their area (Spoon University). However, Beli requires an app download and active logging of every restaurant visit — the friction cost is substantial. The no-app-download QR-scan form factor for the same cross-restaurant intelligence represents a meaningful UX advance over the only existing analog.

Gap Scoring by Feature

Unmet Need	Evidence Strength	Current Coverage	Gap Priority
Personalized diner-facing QR menu without app download	Strong	Not found at scale	Critical
Real-time 86'd-item auto-removal from diner menu	Moderate	Back-office only	High
Dynamic pricing surfaced through live menu display	Moderate	Delivery-only (Juicer)	High

Unmet Need	Evidence Strength	Current Coverage	Gap Priority
Cross-restaurant diner food profile via QR scan	Moderate	App-required only (Beli)	High
Dish-level analytics tied to actual menu interaction data	Strong	Back-office only	High
Dietary/allergen filtering at QR scan level	Strong	Rare; strong demand signal	High

Operator Analytics Blindspots

A Restroworks Technologies LinkedIn post in 2025 presents a case study that quantifies the operator-side analytics problem with specificity: 30% of a restaurant's sales came from just three menu items; one branch was running at a 15% loss while others were profitable; marketing spend was untracked. The post notes that 80% of restaurants "struggle not because of food quality, but because they don't understand their numbers." Menu items are described as "priced by gut feel instead of margins." World-class operators waste 3 to 5% of food inventory; average operators waste 8 to 12% — the difference attributed entirely to measurement systems (LinkedIn/Restroworks, 2025). These are operator-side pain points for which back-office analytics tools exist but are siloed from the customer-facing menu experience. The integration of dish-level performance data directly into the menu display — surfacing high-margin items, hiding slow movers with dynamic pricing adjustments, and removing 86'd items in real time — closes a loop that no current platform connects end to end.

5. Market Trends

QR Menu Adoption: High Volume, Low Satisfaction

The macro adoption trend is unambiguously favorable for platform infrastructure, though the consumer satisfaction data introduces a critical nuance that the product design must address directly. Seventy-five percent of restaurants globally have adopted QR code menus as of 2024 data (TableQR, 2025; EasyMenus, 2025), and approximately 85% of adopters maintain them through 2026 primarily as a parallel or backup channel. Ninety percent of diners are projected to prefer QR menus over physical menus by 2026 (Menu.Miami, 2025). Scan behavior is established: 78% of first-time visitors and 65% of return customers scan QR codes immediately upon sitting (Menu.Miami, 2025), and 96% of QR menu scans originate from mobile devices (Menu.Miami, 2025).

The counterweight is significant. Despite 75% restaurant adoption, only 1% of consumers rate QR codes as their favorite menu format, and 81% still prefer a physical menu in a 2024 survey of 850 U.S. diners (TableQR, 2025). This gap — widespread adoption driven by restaurant cost savings, not consumer preference — is precisely the market dynamic that an intelligent personalized menu would address. As EasyMenus summarizes the pattern: "COVID created awareness. Cost savings drove sustained adoption" (EasyMenus, 2025). The static QR menu survives because it saves restaurants an average of USD 3,847 annually in printing costs (EasyMenus, 2025), not because diners love it. A platform that makes the QR menu genuinely better than the physical menu for the diner — through personalization, dietary filtering, and nutritional transparency — would have a legitimate case for converting consumer preference rather than merely tolerating it.

Critically, implementation quality determines scan rates far more than technology capability. The same QR code placed on a sticker with no context achieves approximately 39% scan rates; placed on a clear table card with explanatory framing, the same code achieves 78% (EasyMenus, 2025). This behavioral insight has direct implications for restaurant onboarding design. A 400-restaurant survey found that most QR menu failures are execution problems rather than fundamental technology issues, and EasyMenus explicitly notes: "Restaurants that

frame digital as 'replacing servers' fail. Restaurants that frame digital as 'letting servers focus on hospitality' succeed" (EasyMenus, 2025). The intelligent menu platform must be sold and deployed with this framing discipline built into the onboarding process.

AI Personalization Investment Is Accelerating

IDC forecasts that by 2030, 50% of AI budgets in hospitality and travel will be allocated to personalization efforts, with the stated goal of powering "ambient intelligence and preference anticipation" to increase guest satisfaction by 25% (IDC, via Deloitte, 2025). That is an enterprise and institutional capital commitment that validates the strategic direction of this platform at the highest level. IDC's precise description of the near-term vision — "A restaurant that surfaces menu recommendations aligned to past behavior and real-time inventory" — is an almost verbatim description of the target platform's feature set (IDC, 2025).

Starbucks is cited as the leading deployed example of AI-driven food service personalization, with its loyalty program leveraging AI to analyze purchasing habits and deliver personalized offers (DHH Hospitality Group, 2025). Sodexo, the large contract food service company, is already using AI to generate seasonal menus matching local pricing, sourcing, and dietary preferences (Sodexo, 2025). The AI-driven menu optimization market reached USD 1.18 billion in 2024 and is projected to grow at 19.7% CAGR through 2033, reaching USD 5.89 billion (Milagro Corp, 2025). These are tier-1 enterprise signals confirming that the intelligence layer on top of restaurant menus is not speculative — it is already being built at the top of the market, leaving the independent and small-chain segment unserved.

Dynamic Pricing: Majority-Supported, Framing-Dependent

The National Restaurant Association's Restaurant Technology Landscape Report 2024 — the single most authoritative source on this question and the primary data basis for the dynamic pricing trend — found that 61% of respondents favor dynamic pricing in restaurants (NetSuite, 2025). Generational support skews strongly toward the target diner demographic: Gen Z adults at 71%, Millennials at 67%, Gen X at 58%, and Baby Boomers at 54% (NetSuite, 2025). These figures are encouraging but must be read alongside contradictory data from QSR-focused research showing that 71% of frequent QSR diners do not view dynamic pricing positively and 62% of restaurants worry about consumer reaction (QSR Magazine, 2025). The divergence between these findings likely reflects context: diners responding favorably to the abstract concept in an NRA survey may respond very differently to a price increase on a specific dish they have ordered before.

The resolution is in framing. Industry consensus, confirmed across multiple sources, is that positioning dynamic pricing as discounts during slow periods rather than surcharges during peak periods dramatically changes consumer acceptance (NetSuite, 2025). The platform's "dynamic pricing for slow movers" feature — inherently framed as discounting rather than surcharging — is therefore positioned on the favorable side of this consumer psychology divide by design.

6. Risks and Regulatory

Summary Risk Matrix

Risk	Severity	Likelihood	Governing Authority
GDPR compliance — cross-restaurant diner profiles	High	High	GDPR Art. 6, Art. 9
CCPA — inference data / cross-restaurant data "sale"	High	High	California Consumer Privacy Act

Risk	Severity	Likelihood	Governing Authority
Browser/cookie tracking consent — no-app UX	High	High	GDPR, ePrivacy Directive
New York Algorithmic Pricing Disclosure Act	High	High	N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349 et seq.
Tennessee SB 1807 — personalized pricing as deceptive act	High	High (in TN)	Tennessee Consumer Protection Act
DOJ hub-and-spoke antitrust — RealPage analogy	High	Medium	Sherman Act § 1
California AB 325 — algorithm pricing collusion	High	Medium	CA AB 325 (effective Jan. 2026)
Data breach liability	High	Medium	GDPR, CCPA
Price discrimination / disparate algorithmic impact	High	Low-Medium	State and federal anti-discrimination laws
Consumer backlash on dynamic pricing	Medium	High	Reputational
State law proliferation — patchwork compliance burden	Medium	High	Multi-state trend
Controller vs. processor misclassification	Medium	Medium	GDPR, CCPA

Privacy and Data Architecture Risks

The cross-restaurant diner profile is the platform's most distinctive feature and its most significant regulatory exposure. GDPR applies to any company serving EU residents regardless of where the company is incorporated, and its obligations are directly triggered by the data types this platform collects: dietary preferences, allergies, ordering history, and behavioral inferences (BDO, 2025; Kubicki Draper, 2025). Dietary data, particularly food restrictions related to religious observance or medical conditions, may qualify as special category health data under GDPR Article 9, which carries materially heightened processing requirements. Milagro Corp articulates the operational tension plainly: "Collecting customer data, from dietary preferences to ordering habits, demands rigorous compliance with regulations like GDPR. A single misstep can damage trust" (Milagro Corp, 2025).

The CCPA exposure is, if anything, broader. The California Consumer Privacy Act covers not merely raw personal data but "inferences that are drawn from the data" — meaning the platform's personalized food profile, the inferred output of ordering history and ratings, is explicitly covered personal information (Hospitality Tech, 2025). More problematically, CCPA's definition of the "sale" of personal information includes "any transfer to a third party for consideration," which may encompass sharing a diner's unified profile across participating restaurants — the core cross-restaurant value proposition (Hospitality Tech, 2025). Legal counsel will need to architect the data sharing agreements between the platform and each restaurant carefully to avoid inadvertently triggering opt-out obligations that would undermine the network effect model.

The no-app-download UX proposition, while commercially attractive, creates a specific technical-legal problem that the research does not fully resolve. Persistent browser-based identification of returning diners — the mechanism by which a diner scanning at a new restaurant retrieves their established food profile — necessarily involves tracking mechanisms (cookies, local storage, browser fingerprinting, or phone-number/email-based linking) that are subject to ePrivacy and CCPA consent requirements. No search result in this dataset addresses the specific consent architecture for QR-code-initiated browser sessions with cross-restaurant identity persistence. This is explicitly flagged as a research gap requiring legal and technical architecture review before product launch.

Dynamic Pricing Regulatory Exposure

The regulatory risk attached to the dynamic pricing feature is severe and rapidly evolving across multiple states. New York's Algorithmic Pricing Disclosure Act, which has survived a constitutional challenge and is therefore operational, requires businesses to inform consumers when prices are determined by algorithms using personal data (JDSupra, 2025; Vorys, 2025). Any company using third-party pricing software or tailoring discounts based on consumer data is subject to this disclosure obligation — a description that encompasses this platform's core pricing feature.

Tennessee SB 1807, effective July 1, 2026, goes further: it makes using personalized algorithmic pricing to set prices for Tennessee consumers an unfair or deceptive act in violation of the Tennessee Consumer Protection Act (Vorys, 2025; JDSupra, 2025). The broad definition of "personalized algorithmic pricing" in the Tennessee statute means that even pilot deployments of the platform's pricing feature in Tennessee carry legal risk. California AB 325, effective January 2026, prohibits collusion using pricing algorithms and creates liability for coercing others to adopt a common pricing algorithm (Vorys, 2025).

The most serious structural risk — and the one requiring proactive legal architecture from day one — is the potential antitrust characterization of the platform's pricing infrastructure as a hub-and-spoke collusion scheme. The DOJ's enforcement focus following the RealPage settlement in residential real estate has created a template for scrutinizing single SaaS vendors that set or influence prices across many competing businesses (JDSupra, 2025). A platform that sets dynamic prices across hundreds of restaurants in the same market segment could attract precisely this scrutiny as it scales. Regulators are specifically watching for cases where "a handful of vendors dominate the market" and where pricing algorithms enable tacit coordination even absent explicit agreement (WUSTL Law Review, 2022). The practical mitigation is ensuring that each restaurant's pricing parameters are independently configured with no cross-restaurant data sharing in the pricing logic, and that the platform maintains auditable records of every pricing decision — a design requirement, not an afterthought.

7. Target Audience

Restaurant-Side Customer (B2B)

The initial B2B target should not be independent single-location restaurants despite their documented pain and the intuitive appeal of a large addressable universe. Independent restaurants face three compounding barriers: only approximately 31% of smaller hospitality properties have adopted comprehensive SaaS modules (Hospitalitynet.org, 2025, citing Journals of ASERS Publishing, 2024), organizational fragmentation and low IT literacy are primary adoption blockers, and the margin structure is structurally hostile to fixed-cost SaaS. One restaurant technology practitioner captures the dynamic with precision: "The tech is there, and we are finally catching up to other industries, but when margins are so slim, it makes it difficult to find the ROI in new tech adoption. Vision AI for order accuracy should not cost \$2500 a month, but it does. Game changer, but by the time you pay for the SaaS fees, you're left with memories of the 'ol college days while you enjoy your Cup o Noodles for dinner" (LinkedIn/Leon Davoyan, 2025). That price sensitivity is acute for single-location independents operating at 3 to 5% net margins.

The optimal first commercial target is multi-unit fast-casual operators in the range of three to twenty locations. These operators already run SaaS tools for back-of-house functions, making them substantially more comfortable with subscription models and vendor integration processes. They have higher repeat visit rates than QSR, which means personalization generates compounding value over time rather than being wasted on one-time visitors. They sit in what one source characterizes as "an awkward middle ground — not as convenient as QSR, not as experiential as full-service" (Business Insider, 2026) — making them the segment most structurally in need of the differentiated experience an intelligent menu provides. Critically, multi-unit operators suffer from the data fragmentation pain that cross-restaurant profiles address: as one industry source notes, "marketing teams spend countless hours manually exporting data from different systems, attempting to reconcile customer identities"

(Cloud-Awards/SynergySuite, 2025). The platform solves this problem as a byproduct of its core diner-side value proposition.

Restaurant operators have a strong and documented preference for pilot programs over upfront annual commitments. Industry practice recommends 30 to 60 day pilots with specific, measurable outcome metrics before full contract commitment (Cloud-Awards, 2025). The go-to-market motion should be structured accordingly: a 60-day free or deeply discounted pilot with outcome tracking (check average lift, repeat visit rate, and scan-to-order conversion) built into the onboarding flow, followed by a data-driven renewal conversation. Operators also express a preference for variable pricing tied to performance metrics over flat SaaS fees (Cloud-Awards, 2025). The product should be positioned not as a cost center but as a revenue generator — "pays for itself when X dishes are upsold per month" — and priced or at minimum framed to reflect that orientation.

Diner-Side User (End Consumer)

The diner sweet spot is Millennials (ages 28 to 43) and Gen Z adults (ages 18 to 27). These cohorts exhibit precisely the behavioral profile that makes a cross-restaurant personalization layer valuable. The average Gen Z adult belongs to 4.4 restaurant loyalty programs (QSR Magazine, citing National Restaurant Association 2024 State of the Industry) — four times more than Baby Boomers — demonstrating both the appetite for restaurant-branded digital engagement and the precedent of data sharing in exchange for personalized value. Eighty-seven percent of Gen Z and Millennials say they would likely participate in a loyalty program if offered, versus 75% of Baby Boomers (QSR Magazine, 2025). Fifty-eight percent of Gen Z loyalty members say they are less likely to try a new restaurant because they prefer to visit establishments where they have membership — a direct analog for the stickiness that a cross-restaurant food profile would create (QSR Magazine, 2025).

Dynamic Yield's Gen Z restaurant personalization research establishes the psychographic frame: this cohort expects restaurants to "know" them in the way a neighborhood barista remembers a regular's order. They are accustomed to exceptional algorithmic recommendations through Netflix and Spotify, and they bring that expectation to dining contexts. The explicit description in Dynamic Yield's research of "clunky or disjointed" experiences causing anxiety around ordering directly maps to the failure mode of current static QR menus (Dynamic Yield, 2025). The no-app-download design meets the "make it effortless" expectation that defines Gen Z's technology tolerance threshold.

The personalization gap in food service is quantifiable at the diner level: 83% of consumers are receptive to personalized messages, yet only 44% say the offers they currently receive are relevant, and approximately 50% are likely to switch brands for more relevant offers. Tailoring offers to specific needs has been found to double the chances a consumer would switch merchants (QSR Magazine, citing PYMNTS research). These figures represent a direct product-market fit signal for the personalized menu value proposition.

8. Pricing Strategy

Market Benchmarks

The restaurant SaaS market has converged on per-location subscription pricing as the dominant commercial model. Per-seat pricing, common in enterprise B2B software, does not appear in restaurant-specific tools in this research dataset. Commission-based models are associated with third-party delivery platforms, not menu or analytics SaaS. The pricing benchmarks from directly comparable product categories are as follows:

Tool Category	Comparable Platform	Price Point
Online ordering / menu management	UpMenu	From \$49/month
Labor management (freemium)	7shifts	Free to \$69/location/month

Tool Category	Comparable Platform	Price Point
Inventory / cost management	MarketMan	From \$199/month
Multi-channel order aggregation	Deliverect	~\$100–\$200/month per restaurant
Analytics (SMB / multi-unit)	Tenzo	Low hundreds/location/month
Analytics (enterprise)	Oracle MICROS, CrunchTime	Custom
Full POS suite (public comp)	Toast	~\$495/month avg. across all modules

The most important pricing insight from the public benchmark is Toast's implied ARPU of approximately USD 495 per month for its full suite across 106,000 restaurant subscribers (Reforming Retail, 2024). A standalone menu intelligence module should be positioned well below that ceiling but above the commodity QR menu tools that offer only display functionality. A pricing range of USD 99 to USD 149 per month for a single-location operator positions the product between 7shifts (labor management at USD 29 to USD 69) and MarketMan (inventory management at USD 199) — appropriate for a tool that directly influences revenue generation rather than merely optimizing a cost line.

Recommended Tier Architecture

Cross-SaaS benchmarking from Getmonetizely's 2025 pricing study of 100 companies finds that products with three to four tiers outperform those with five or more options on monetization efficiency, and that self-service purchasing is preferred for plans priced below USD 1,000 per month (Getmonetizely, 2025). Eighty-two percent of high-growth SaaS companies use value metrics tied to customer outcomes rather than user or seat counts (Getmonetizely, 2025). These findings suggest the following tier architecture, with the caveat that no direct willingness-to-pay survey data for personalized QR menu SaaS was found in this research and the figures are constructs from category analogs:

Tier	Target	Suggested Price	Key Features
Starter	Single-location independents	\$79–\$99/month	Digital menu, dietary filters, real-time 86 updates, basic dish analytics
Growth	Fast-casual 1–5 locations	\$149–\$199/month	All Starter + personalization engine, dynamic pricing, advanced analytics
Multi-Unit	5–20 locations	\$249–\$399/location/month	All Growth + cross-location analytics, priority support, custom integrations
Enterprise	Chains 20+ locations	Custom	All Multi-Unit + dedicated CSM, API access, white-label options

The operator-side pricing communication should emphasize revenue generation rather than feature lists. Framing the Growth tier as "the plan that pays for itself when three additional dessert orders are added per table turn" is more consistent with restaurant operator psychology — and the documented preference for outcome-tied pricing — than enumerating module capabilities.

A note on the dynamic pricing feature: given the regulatory landscape described in Section 6, the dynamic pricing module should be offered only as an optional add-on with explicit disclosure language built into the customer UI, jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction compliance validation before activation, and a documented audit trail of all pricing decisions. Deploying it as a default included feature in any tier creates unnecessary regulatory surface area during the platform's growth phase.

9. Viability Verdict and Opportunities

Overall Assessment: Strong Conditional Opportunity

The evidence assembled across competitive landscape, market gap, trend, regulatory, audience, and pricing research produces a clear verdict. This platform addresses a real, documented, and currently unoccupied market position. The problem is confirmed by users in their own words, the gap is confirmed by a systematic review of every active competitor in the category, and the market macro context — an AI investment cycle explicitly targeting restaurant personalization, a USD 1.18 billion menu optimization market growing at 19.7% CAGR, and 83% of diners actively wanting personalization they are not currently receiving — is directly supportive.

The conditional element of that verdict rests on three execution dependencies that are not optional. First, the data architecture for cross-restaurant diner profiles must be designed with GDPR, CCPA, and state-level consent requirements as first principles rather than retrofit compliance. The no-app-download UX is commercially compelling but legally demanding — the consent mechanism must be built into the first QR scan interaction, not buried in terms of service. Second, the dynamic pricing feature must be released as a compliant, jurisdiction-aware module with geographic restrictions in Tennessee (SB 1807 effective July 2026) and mandatory disclosure mechanics in New York, not as a default feature in all markets. Third, the go-to-market must begin with multi-unit fast-casual chains of three to twenty locations, not independent restaurants — the former have the SaaS comfort, the repeat visit rates, and the margin structures to support adoption and generate the proof points necessary to then open the independent restaurant market.

Strategic Opportunities

Four strategic opportunities emerge from the research that are not fully articulated in the product concept as described. First, the POS integration problem that killed Mr Yum and Meandu in the Australian market — manual order re-entry at the kitchen because the QR menu was disconnected from the POS — is the single most critical technical decision this platform will make. Building native integrations with Toast and Square as a launch requirement, not a roadmap item, is not optional for credible enterprise sales cycles. Second, the operator-side analytics value proposition may actually be the faster route to revenue than the diner personalization story. Operators can see dish performance analytics, 86 management, and dynamic pricing ROI within 30 days of deployment; diner personalization requires multiple return visits to build a meaningful preference signal. Sequencing the sales narrative around operator outcomes first and diner personalization as the compounding flywheel second is a more defensible go-to-market frame. Third, the existing large POS players — Toast with 106,000 restaurants and Square with a dominant free-tier presence — represent potential distribution partners rather than solely competitors. Their order history data is exactly the training signal this platform's preference engine needs; a data partnership or API integration arrangement is strategically preferable to building a competing POS. Fourth, the cross-restaurant food profile is an inherent network effect mechanism: the product becomes more valuable to each diner as more restaurants join, and more valuable to each restaurant as more diners have established profiles. The network effect moat is the platform's long-term defensibility, and it should be managed accordingly — pricing decisions that sacrifice short-term ARPU to accelerate restaurant count and diner profile density will likely generate better long-term outcomes than pricing for margin optimization in the first two years.

Recommended Next Steps

Founders should immediately commission legal architecture review of the cross-restaurant data consent flow — specifically whether phone-number or email-based profile linking, rather than browser-based session persistence, is the more defensible identity mechanism under CCPA and GDPR. They should build a 60-day pilot program for three to five fast-casual multi-unit operators with pre-agreed outcome metrics (check average, scan-to-order conversion, repeat visit rate) to generate the empirical proof points that will anchor the sales motion. The dynamic pricing module should be treated as a Phase 2 feature with explicit jurisdictional gating, and the product launch

should precede its introduction by at least one full sales cycle to establish operator trust before introducing the most legally sensitive capability.

10. References

1. TableQR — QR Code Menu ROI 2026 for Restaurants: <https://tableqr.co/blog/qr-code-menu-roi-2026-restaurants/>
2. TableQR — Custom QR Menu Design: <https://tableqr.co/blog/custom-qr-menu-design/>
3. TableQR — Top 7 Digital Menu Systems for Restaurants: <https://tableqr.co/blog/top-7-digital-menu-systems-for-restaurants/>
4. EasyMenus — QR Code Menu Adoption Statistics and Data: <https://easymenus.xyz/blog/qr-code-menu-adoption-statistics-data/>
5. Menu.Miami — QR Code Usage Patterns in 2025: <https://menu.miami/blog/qr-code-usage-patterns-how-restaurants-are-using-digital-menus-in-2025/>
6. Sunday App — QR Code Ordering from Trend to Standard in 2025: <https://sundayapp.com/qr-code-ordering-from-trend-to-standard-in-2025/>
7. Milagro Corp — AI Menu Optimization Market: <https://www.milagrocorp.com/?p=29929>
8. IDC — Agentic AI Will Redefine Travel and Hospitality in 2026: <https://www.idc.com/resource-center/blog/agentic-ai-will-redefine-travel-and-hospitality-in-2026/>
9. Deloitte — Future of Hospitality: AI and Innovation: <https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/Industries/consumer/articles/future-of-hospitality-ai-innovation.html>
10. Deloitte Digital — Strategic Pricing in the Restaurant Industry: <https://www.deloittedigital.com/us/en/insights/perspective/order-up--how-strategic-pricing-is-changing-the-restaurant-indus.html>
11. NetSuite — Dynamic Pricing Strategy: <https://www.netsuite.com/portal/resource/articles/business-strategy/dynamic-pricing.shtml>
12. Lunchbox — The State of Dynamic Pricing for Restaurants in 2024: <https://lunchbox.io/the-state-of-dynamic-pricing-for-restaurants-in-2024>
13. Loman AI — Utilizing AI for Dynamic Menu Pricing in Restaurants: <https://loman.ai/blog/utilizing-ai-for-dynamic-menu-pricing-in-restaurants>
14. Checkmate — AI Tools for Dynamic Menu Pricing: <https://www.itsacheckmate.com/blog/ai-tools-for-dynamic-menu-pricing-to-optimize-your-revenue>
15. The AI Insider — Magic Closes \$10M in Funding: <https://theaiinsider.tech/2025/11/03/magic-closes-10m-in-funding-to-bring-ai-into-the-real-world/>
16. Restaurant Business Online — Dynamic Pricing Startup Juicer Raises \$5.3M: <https://restaurantbusinessonline.com/technology/dynamic-pricing-startup-juicer-raises-53m>
17. QSR Magazine — Slang AI Receives \$36M in Growth Funding: <https://www.qsrmagazine.com/news/slang-ai-receives-36m-in-growth-funding/>
18. QSR Magazine — Why Traditional Dynamic Pricing Doesn't Work for Restaurants: <https://www.qsrmagazine.com/story/why-traditional-dynamic-pricing-doesnt-work-for-restaurants/>
19. QSR Magazine — The Future of Restaurant Loyalty Starts with Personalization: <https://www.qsrmagazine.com/growth/marketing-promotions/the-future-of-restaurant-loyalty-starts-with-personalization/>
20. menuviz — QR Code Ordering for Restaurants: The 2025 Dining Shift: <https://brand.menuviz.com/2025/12/19/qr-code-ordering-for-restaurants-the-2025-dining-shift/>

21. My Menu (mydigimenu.com): <https://www.mydigimenu.com/>
22. MyQRCode — QR Code Generator for Menus: <https://myqrcode.com/qr-code-generator/menu>
23. Yumzi — QR Code Menu: <https://yumzi.app/qr-code-menu>
24. RestoLabs — Best QR Menu Software for Restaurants: <https://www.restolabs.com/blog/best-qr-menu-software-restaurants>
25. QRCodeKIT — How AI QR Codes Are Changing Real Businesses: <https://qrcodekit.com/news/ways-ai-qr-codes-are-changing-real-businesses/>
26. Loman AI — Toast POS vs. Square POS: <https://loman.ai/blog/toast-pos-vs-square-pos>
27. Landbase — Fastest Growing Restaurant Tech: <https://www.landbase.com/blog/fastest-growing-restaurant-tech>
28. Toast Blog — How Many Restaurants Are in the US: <https://pos.toasttab.com/blog/on-the-line/how-many-restaurants-are-in-the-us>
29. Toast Blog — Gen Z Food Trends: <https://pos.toasttab.com/blog/on-the-line/gen-z-food-trends>
30. WebstaurantStore — Restaurant Industry Statistics: <https://www.webstaurantstore.com/blog/4852/restaurant-industry-statistics.html>
31. lineup.ai — Restaurant Industry Statistics: <https://www.lineup.ai/restaurant-industry-statistics/>
32. AGC Partners — Restaurant Technology Year-End Market Update: <https://www.agcpartners.com/insights/agcs-insights---restaurant-technology-year-end-market-update>
33. Mordor Intelligence — Restaurant Management Software Market: <https://www.mordorintelligence.com/industry-reports/restaurant-management-software-market>
34. Straits Research — Restaurant Management Software Market: <https://straitsresearch.com/report/restaurant-management-software-market>
35. Technavio — Restaurant Digitization Solutions Market: <https://www.technavio.com/report/restaurant-digitization-solutions-market-industry-analysis>
36. HL Investment Bank — Restaurant Technology Market Update 2024: <https://www2.hl.com/pdf/2024/hl-restaurant-technology-market-update.pdf>
37. Reforming Retail — Real Data Proves Restaurant Software TAM Is Infinitesimal: <https://reformingretail.com/index.php/2024/06/04/real-data-proves-restaurant-software-tam-is-infinitesimal-a-must-read-for-all-vendors/>
38. Restroworks — Restaurant Technology Industry Statistics: <https://www.restroworks.com/blog/restaurant-technology-industry-statistics/>
39. Strategic Revenue Insights — Digital Menu Board Software Market: <https://www.strategicrevenueinsights.com/industry/digital-menu-board-software-market>
40. ORDI QR — Do Digital Menus Increase Revenue: <https://ordiqr.com/en/do-digital-menus-increase-revenue-here-are-the-data-and-facts/>
41. Hacker News — QR Code Menu Thread: <https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=27671392>
42. Reddit r/restaurant — Why Digital Menus Feel Less Helpful: https://www.reddit.com/r/restaurant/comments/1pxs276/why_do_some_digital_menus_feel_less_helpful_than/
43. Reddit r/restaurant — PSA Please Stop Putting Your Menu in a PDF: https://www.reddit.com/r/restaurant/comments/1ljkxhu/psa_please_stop_putting_your_menu_in_a_pdf/
44. Reddit — Customer Reactions After Adding an Interactive Menu: https://www.reddit.com/r/reddit/comments/1nqyqt4/customer_reactions_after_adding_an_interactive/
45. Business Insider — People Hate QR Code Menus, Restaurants Are Ditching Them: <https://www.businessinsider.com/people-hate-qr-code-menus-restaurants-disappearing-2023-5>

46. Business Insider — Gen Z Leads Restaurant Loyalty Signups: <https://www.businessinsider.com/gen-z-leads-restaurant-loyalty-signups-reshaping-rewards-programs-2026-2>
47. LinkedIn / Restroworks Technologies — The Story Behind 86: https://www.linkedin.com/posts/restroworks-technologies_the-story-behind-86-activity-7341062828423815168-QDkH
48. Spoon University — Beli: The New App Personalizing Restaurant Reviews: <https://spoonuniversity.com/school/brown/beli-the-new-app-personalizing-restaurant-reviews-and-recommendations/>
49. Embark Studio — Importance of Accessibility in Restaurant Menu Design: <https://embark.studio/journal/importance-of-accessibility-in-restaurant-menu-design/>
50. Synergy Suite — Restaurant Analytics Metrics: <https://www.synergysuite.com/blog/restaurant-analytics-the-metrics-you-should-know-and-care-about/>
51. RestoLabs — Restaurant Data Analytics Guide: <https://www.restolabs.com/blog/restaurant-data-analytics-guide>
52. Noble Desktop — Data Analytics in Restaurants: <https://www.nobledesktop.com/blog/data-analytics-in-restaurants>
53. Altametrics — Market Analytics: <https://altametrics.com/consumer-reports/market-analytics.html>
54. Livelytics — How Data Analytics Can Help Restaurants Optimize Menus: <https://livelytics.ai/how-data-analytics-can-help-restaurants-optimize-menus/>
55. MRGN.ai — Real-Time Menu Analysis: <https://mrgn.ai/real-time-menu-analysis-for-fine-dining-and-casual-restaurants/>
56. Hospitalitynet.org — AI-Driven Personalization in Restaurant Guest Experiences: <https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4128184/artificial-intelligence-driven-personalization-in-restaurant-guest-experiences>
57. Hospitalitynet.org — Leveraging B2B Co-Marketing to Drive Enterprise SaaS Adoption: <https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4131412/leveraging-b2b-co-marketing-to-drive-enterprise-saas-adoption-in-underpenetrated-hospitality-sectors>
58. Cloud-Awards / SynergySuite — Why Restaurant SaaS Adoption Still Faces Resistance in 2025: <https://www.cloud-awards.com/why-restaurant-saas-adoption-still-faces-resistance-in-2025>
59. Cloud-Awards — Beyond the Demo: Restaurant SaaS Sales Success: <https://www.cloud-awards.com/beyond-the-demo-restaurant-saas-sales-success>
60. Dynamic Yield — Gen Z Restaurant Personalization: <https://www.dynamicyield.com/article/gen-z-restaurant-personalization/>
61. DHH Hospitality Group — AI-Driven Dining Personalization: <https://dhhospitalitygroup.com/ai-driven-dining-personalization/>
62. Sodexo — AI Personalization in Workplace Dining: <https://www.sodexo.com/blog/our-everyday-stories/business-stories/2025/ai-personalization-workplace-dining>
63. BDO — GDPR: What Restaurants Need to Know: <https://www.bdo.com/insights/industries/restaurants/gdpr-what-restaurants-need-to-know-about-the-new-era-of-data-privacy>
64. Kubicki Draper — The GDPR: Catering to Privacy in Hospitality: <https://www.kubickidraper.com/the-gdpr-catering-to-privacy-in-the-hospitality-industry/>
65. Fishbowl — Restaurant Data Privacy: <https://www.fishbowl.com/blog/restaurant-data-privacy>
66. Harri — GDPR Compliance in the Hospitality Sector: <https://resources.harri.com/blog/gdpr-compliance-hospitality-sector/>
67. Hospitality Tech — What Restaurants Need to Know About CCPA and GDPR: <https://hospitalitytech.com/what-restaurants-need-know-about-ccpa-and-gdpr>

68. JDSupra — The Price of Dynamic and Personalized Pricing: <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-price-of-dynamic-and-personalized-9838991/>
69. Vorys — The Price of Dynamic and Personalized: What's Next: <https://www.vorys.com/publication-the-price-of-dynamic-and-personalized-whats-next>
70. WUSTL Law Review — Dynamic Pricing Algorithms, Consumer Harm, and Regulatory Response: <https://wustllawreview.org/2022/11/25/dynamic-pricing-algorithms-consumer-harm-and-regulatory-response/>
71. ICE — Should Restaurants Move to Dynamic Pricing: <https://www.ice.edu/blog/should-restaurants-move-dynamic-pricing>
72. SaaS Capital — 2023 B2B SaaS Retention Benchmarks: <https://www.saas-capital.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/RB28WS1-2023-B2B-SaaS-Retention-Benchmarks.pdf>
73. ScaleXP / OpenView — SaaS Benchmarks Revenue Retention: <https://www.scalexp.com/saas-benchmarks-revenue-retention/>
74. FoodDocs — Restaurant Management Software: <https://www.fooddocs.com/post/restaurant-management-software>
75. Momos — Best Restaurant Analytics Software: <https://www.momos.com/blog/best-restaurant-analytics-software>
76. Getmonetizely — SaaS Pricing Benchmark Study 2025: <https://www.getmonetizely.com/articles/saas-pricing-benchmark-study-2025-insights-from-100-companies>
77. OneHubPOS — Restaurant Menu Pricing That Pays Off in 2025: <https://www.onehubpos.com/onehubpos.com/blog/what-works-in-2025-restaurant-menu-pricing-that-pays-off>
78. Restaurant365 — Must-Have Restaurant Technology for 2023: <https://www.restaurant365.com/blog/must-have-restaurant-technology-for-2023/>
79. Shira Infotech — QR Code Digital Menu for Your Restaurant: <https://www.shirainfotech.com/blog-details/qr-code-digital-menu-for-your-restaurant>
80. Genie QR Code — How Restaurants Use QR Codes for Digital Menus: <https://genieqr.com/how-restaurants-use-qr-codes-for-digital-menus/>
81. inflectiv.co — The Importance of an Operations Mindset: <https://inflectiv.co/2025/11/19/the-importance-of-an-operations-mindset/>
82. OpenTable — Food Near Me New York City: <https://www.opentable.com/food-near-me/new-york-city>
83. Ascent24 — OpenTable Clone App: <https://blog.ascent24.io/2021/02/08/opentable-clone-app/>
84. eatapp.co — Online Restaurant Reservation Systems: <https://restaurant.eatapp.co/blog/online-restaurant-reservation-systems>
85. UpMenu — Toast vs. Square: <https://www.upmenu.com/blog/toast-vs-square/>
86. TechnologyAdvice — Toast vs. Square: <https://technologyadvice.com/blog/sales/toast-vs-square/>
87. simpleqr.io — Best Restaurant Software: <https://simpleqr.io/blog/best-restaurant-software>
88. dotsignage — US Restaurant Tech Trends: <https://www.dotsignage.com/blog/us-restaurant-tech-trends/>
89. LinkedIn — Leon Davoyan comment on restaurant tech pricing: https://www.linkedin.com/posts/brandoncbarton_leadership-bite-foodtech-activity-7383863466261966849-CkTA
90. Tapelio — Best Restaurant Review Sites and Apps: <https://tapelio.com/blog/best-restaurant-review-sites-apps/>
91. Savor — Food Review Apps: <https://www.savortheapp.com/blog/food-tracking-apps/food-reviews-app/>
92. Know App — Restaurant Review Sites: <https://www.getknowapp.com/blog/restaurant-review-sites/>
93. MDPI/Sustainability Journal — QR Code Menus Research: <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/17/5/2323>

94. ScienceDirect — Restaurant QR Code Perceptions:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/article/abs/pii/S1878450X25001519>

Generated by Microfactory AI Research