

Editor's Comment:

Accepted after Minor revision

The manuscript is very important for the varietal selection in order to benefit not only farmers but also traders in the research area, it is therefore of very important to the scientific community.

The abstract is comprehensive. I made some comments, however, regarding the tools (conjoint Analysis) implemented in the analysis as well as an extensive addition of discussion sentences on the result (please refers to the manuscript, marked in red yellow colour))

The subsection structure generally appropriate. However:

The back ground of the study regarding specific reasons for the study to be done, seem to be obtained from the results of the study itself, or preliminary observations, or other previous studies, in which case, reference is needed.

The objectives of the study were not clearly stated.

Some of the terms needed to be defined in practical terms (utility scores, relative importance, part-worth, traders-cum-dal millers, traders/dal millers etc.)

The use of other tools such as Pearson and Kendal's correlations is not indicated and described in the methodology.

-Some questions are posted within the text regarding the relative importance of the characters in the study.

The Table and the graph seem to occupy much space

The manuscript is scientifically correct despite some small suggested revisions.

Would be much better if more references are added. However, I do not have any suggestions this time.

The language is suitable for scholarly communication

Since this is a practical, field experiment, the description/explanation (the language), in my opinion need to be more of practical and less conceptual or sophisticated/political, especially at the sub-title of practical/specific back grounds, Methodology, Results, Conclusion.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Semuel Leunufna
Associate Professor, Pattimura University, Ambon, Indonesia.