

Editorial comments:

The paper is very interesting and well written. However, there are some mistakes which should be revised.

It would be more professionally to separate the Introduction section from the Literature background section. The second approach is to write only Introduction section, but this section should have atypical (and very useful) construction.

The introduction is where you sketch out the background of your study, including why you have investigated the question that you have and how it relates to earlier research that has been done in the field. A typical (and very useful) construction of an introduction proceeds as follows:

1. Open with two or three sentences placing your study subject in context.
2. Follow with a description of the problem and its history, including previous research.
3. Describe how your work addresses a gap in existing knowledge or ability (here's where you'll state why you've undertaken this study).
4. State what information your paper will address and present aims of your paper.
5. Describe a structure of your paper.

There is a lack of points 3, 4, and 5 in your paper's Introduction.

In addition, in the Conclusion section you should answers the questions: What are the implications of the findings (for researchers and practitioners)? Are the findings unique to the some contexts? Is it universally applicable in any context (country, world region, etc.)?, What are the limitations of the findings (You did not identify the limitation according to the reviewer remark)?

This is a good paper. However it may be improved. The authors did not take into account the comments of reviewers concerning Introduction and Conclusion.

Author's feedback:

Sorry but We disagree with this Reviewer.

What he / she suggests is not feasible: in its present form the introduction gives an overall description of the situation and describes (with a lot of references) what is known about the consumers of organic products in Italy. We did not intend to make a very detailed and very long literature review because our paper is a research paper, not a simple illustration of what has been done in the past. We based our paper on solid and documented foundations, to go further. In this form, the paper is balanced: if we start commenting the Literature, as suggested by this Reviewer, then the paper becomes unbalanced, with a too long Introduction and Literature Review.

Concerning the Conclusions, it seems that the Reviewer did not read properly the article: we give suggestions to the practitioners (see lines 391 – 399). We have added references to previous work and added one statement about future research.

We think it was enough.

The other two Reviewers did not mention these points. It' a majority rule or you look for consensus? If we accept the demands of this Reviewer, what next? Then the other two Reviewers might say that the second / third version is too long.. and that we should merge / reduce the length and details of Introduction and Literature Review... .

Thanks for your collaboration.