

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128265
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumer Preferences of Chia products- A Conjoint Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 offers valuable insights into consumer preferences for chia products, a rapidly growing segment in the functional food market. The study contributes to understanding the socio-economic, dietary, and behavioral factors driving chia consumption, which can be pivotal for producers, marketers, and policymakers aiming to expand chia's market penetration. Additionally, the use of conjoint analysis and Garrett's ranking technique strengthens its methodological foundation and relevance in consumer behavior research. The findings hold promise for improving product development, market strategies, and sustainable agriculture practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is relevant but could be made more precise to reflect the study's geographic and methodological focus. Suggested alternative: "Consumer Preferences for Chia Products in Bangalore: Insights from Conjoint Analysis"	
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 it is overly dense with details, making it harder to quickly grasp the main findings. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize the methodology in fewer words. Highlight the most significant findings succinctly (e.g., socio-economic factors and key preferences). Avoid including historical background in the abstract. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate. The application of conjoint analysis and Garrett's ranking technique is appropriate and effectively supports the research objectives. However, clarifications on certain points could enhance scientific rigor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conjoint analysis formula needs better explanation (e.g., define terms like "ani-amj=1 VijXij"). Statistical significance levels for results (e.g., Table 5) should be explicitly discussed. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and include a mix of recent and foundational studies. However, consider adding more international studies on chia seed consumption to broaden the context. For example: Studies exploring chia preferences in other urban settings or global markets. Research on the economic feasibility of chia production and marketing.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is sufficient for scholarly communication but requires minor revisions for clarity and grammatical consistency. Suggestions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Simplify overly complex sentences in the abstract and discussion sections.● Avoid redundancy, particularly in the introduction and methodology.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhang Weiwei
Department, University & Country	Changshu Institute of Technology, China