1. REVIEW

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

I appreciate that the authors submitted a manuscript that is interesting, and is linked to the objectives of the journal, however, there are some issues that have to be reconsidered.

In general, we have followed the reviewer's observations and suggestions to improve the clarity of the manuscript for the readers and have made language and style corrections. We thank the reviewer for these insightful comments and suggestions, which have greatly improved the readability of the text.

The **Title** is rather complicated to understand, and even if that is not, necessarily, a negative aspect, I, personally, recommend making it clearer.

Answer: Thanks for the recommendation. We have made the suggested change.

The **objective** of the manuscript is to analyze the short commercialization circuits for agroecological foods as a contribution to the productive development in the rural Andean area of the Pillaro canton, by a quantitative approach involving cross-sectional data collection.

Answer: Thanks for the recommendation. We have made the suggested change.

The **Abstract** should be completed with some relevant findings (expressed in numbers, for a better impact on the reader). Also, in this part, a too-large share is allocated to the concept presentation compared with the result and conclusions.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and we have made the changes

In the **introduction**, the presentation of the structure of the paper is missing. Also, the main objective and the potential secondary objectives are not sufficiently pointed out.

The part of the **Literature Review** is somehow, mixed with the Introduction. The authors need to clarify that. Anyway, this part itis needed to construct the literature gap, which is not clearly pointed out, as mentioned before. General text about the topic (one para), focus on its relevance and importance for the industry, practice, and theory. Then briefly inform readers that there is a surge in wellness experience, and xx and xx studies have been organized so far. One para on what has been done so far on the topic. Then talk about research gaps- What are the keys and why are they important or need to be addressed now? Clearly present 3-4 research gaps on this topic. Finally, present the focus of the current study. What are its RQs and details on the method – briefly say about data, country, context, and theory. Which is the novelty and contribution of the study?

Answer: Thanks for the suggestion. Information has been added.

The **results** are interesting, but, sometimes confusing. For instance, lines 159-163,, somehow, tries to convince the reader that 89% is higher than 96% (at least that is the first impression).

Answer: Thanks for the recommendation. We have made the suggested change.

The **discussion** part is too short compared with the results. But that is because of the lack of a literature review. I suggest making an adequate comparison of the results with the previous literature; however, the

authors must emphasize the contribution of the manuscript to the literature, leading to theoretical implications. That means creating an adequate literature review.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and we have made the changes

The **conclusions** part seem to be superficial, there are missing the limits of the research (which exists in fact to this study) and there are no recommendations for the government, scholars, forests/parks administrators etc.

Answer: Thanks for the recommendation. We have made the suggested change.

The **references** are valid but not consistent as, again, the scientific literature gap is almost missing.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and we have made the changes

The **tables** and **figures** are clear and enough.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and we have made the changes