25 February 2013

**THE EDITOR**

**Acta Commercii**

Dear Dr Goldman

**RE: THE INFLUENCE OF SELECTED SENSES ON THE TASTINESS OF BRANDY**

Thank you for the detailed review of the above-mentioned article. We have addressed all issues and/or comments in the following way:

Title of the article (**Comment:** *Make it more marketing oriented and less culinary oriented*.)

We changed the article title to:The influence of selected senses on consumer experience: A brandy case

Context and motivation of study (**Comment:** *Physical and perceptual screens can also be employed*.)

Good idea. We incorporated some articles referring to perceptual screens (indicated in red in final document).

Inclusion of senses of touch and taste (**Comment:** *The sense of taste is very important in the context of the current study. Even if you do not test these senses you will have to discuss it before you rationalize why you are only going to use the three you did use.*)

We have included a brief discussion on both the touch and taste senses. Also indiacted in red in the final document.

Stated hypotheses (**Comment:** *Your hypotheses refer to consumer experience, while your title refer to tastiness.*)

Apologies, sloppy mistake on our part. We fixed the hypotheses to match the data analysis performed (ie effect of smell, sight, sound on tastiness of brandy).

Research design (**Comment:** *The experimental design presents problems. You enhance the smell and sound sense, but diminish the sense of sight by taking away the color of the product. This creates problems with the interpretation of your results later on.*)

We approached the Statistics Consultant at our university, Prof M Kidd, about this specific comment. He indiacted that if the correct conclusions are drawn from the results, positive/negative experimental designs are not necesarilly problamatic. He was more worried about whether the coding of the data (ie effects coding) was correct. He was kind enough to check our data set and concluded that the research design is acceptable. He did, however, made some suggestions on our conclusions and we have incorporated those.

Which experimental group was repeated?

Indicated in red in the final document.

Conclusions (**Comment:** *You are finding that when consumers do not see the color of the brandy without manipulating smell or sound they recorded the highest level of tastiness. Do you find then that firms should remove the color of brandy to make it more tasty. This is where the inclusion of positive and negative stimuli in your experimental design (see earlier) creates problems*, etc.)

Based on Prof M Kidd’s suggestions, we amended our final conclusions. These amendments are also indicated in red in the final document.

1. Implications: (**Comment:** *The implications and applications of these findings need strengthening. The question that needs to be clearly answered is “so what”, which at this stage needs clarification. The value of the research on page 1 does not come through clearly in the discussion and conclusions*.)

Again, based on Prof M Kidd’s suggestions, we amended the managerial implications of the study. These amendments are also indicated in red in the final document.

1. Reference errors

Thank you, we have rectified the reference errors. There are, however, two comments that need clarification. Wolfe et al is an “in site” reference in Suhonen and Tengvall 2009. And it would seem that the two masters’ dissertations do indeed have two authors each.

Kind regards

The authors