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“Analysis of consumer preferences for prepaid mobile internet packages in Iran- A Discrete Choice Experiment”

We appreciate the interest that the editors and reviewers have taken in our manuscript and the constructive criticism they have given. We would also thank you for exempting our manuscript from publication fee. We did our best to address the concerns of the reviewers. Please find below our detailed replies to your comments (reproduced for your convenience). Our replies are marked in *italic*.

**Reply to Referee**

Thank you very much for your valuable comments and helpful suggestions, which have been incorporated in the new version of the paper. It is our belief that the manuscript was substantially improved after making the suggested edits. Please find below our detailed replies to your comments (reproduced for your convenience). Our replies are marked in *italic*:

**Reviewer’s comment:** **Need to add one more sentence in the abstract to state the research problem explicitelly.**

*Author’s response: In line with the reviewer's comment, new sentences that explain the attributes and levels assignment phase of the study are added to the abstract section. We try to offer an overall perspective of the problem by adding the new sentences beside other sentences in the abstract.*

**Reviewer’s comment:** **Overall, need to reduce the length of the content of Introduction in one side and increase the content of discussion in the other side. Introduction should be written orderly following the structure of content (nature of the problem, previous work, purpose, and contribution of the paper).**

*Author’s response: Following the recommendation of the reviewer, the size of the introduction is reduced by removing 121 words. Moreover, the discussion section is extended. It is tried to write the introduction based on the recomended standard structure. First, the nature of the problem is studied in paragraph 1 to 7, next the literature is reviewed in paragraphs 9 and 10, and finally the purpose and contribution of the article are described in paragraph 11 and 12.*

**Reviewer’s comment:** **Need to rearrange the sort of literatures review descendingly (older to newer year).**

*Author’s response: In order to address the reviewer's concern, The literature that was not arranged descending are rearranged. For example “(Confraria et al., 2017; Koh & Lee, 2010; Kwak & Yoo, 2012; Sobolewski & Kopczewski, 2017)” is rearranged to “( Koh & Lee, 2010; Kwak & Yoo, 2012; Confraria et al., 2017; Sobolewski & Kopczewski, 2017)”. The literature review is dividend to 4 parts including:*

*-Literature on conjoint analysis and discrete choice experiment field that is review based on below order: (1927, 1952, 1983).*

*-Utilization of conjoint analysis in different disciplines that is reviewed based on below order: (2018,2018,2018).*

*-Utilization of conjoint analysis in Telecommunication industry that is reviewed based on below order: (2010,2012,2017,2017).*

*-Utilization of conjoint analysis to study internet services that is reviewed based on below order: (1997,2006,2010,2012,2012,2015,2016).*

*In each part, the literature is reviewed in descending order.*

**Reviewer’s comment: Need to compress the content of Research Method in order to give more space for Discussion.**

*Author’s response: In line with the reviewer's comment, the research method is compressed by removing some words. In this direction, two viewpoints are considered, decreasing the size of the research method section and offering a clear explanation of research method.*

**Reviewer’s comment: Need numbering to every equation**

*Author’s response: Following the recommendation of the reviewer, all the equations are numbered.*

**Reviewer’s comment: The Discussion has been presented clearly but too consice. There are so many interesting findings that can be be discussed more detail. The findings should also be connected with the previous literatures. The contribution of work to the science (economics/marketing) is not so clear.**

*Author’s response: As suggested by the reviewer, the discussion section is extended, and more findings are expressed in this section. More specifically, the discussion section is extended by adding 4 paragraphs including 492 words. Paragraph 1 in discussion section is a new paragraph that explains the case study and the importance of the study. Paragraph 2 describes how the article covers the limitations in previous literature. It is mentioned that the previous research cannot be extended to the case study presented in the manuscript. Moreover, although previous literature has paid attention to internet services, current research is the first that considers the consumers’ preferences about prepaid mobile internet. We also did our best to explain the contributions and implication of the study in both marketing and economics area by adding new content to discussion section. Paragraph 3 discusses the implications about attributes selection and evaluation. Paragraph 6 in discussion section, as another new paragraph explains how practitioners can deploy simulation. Moreover, it demonstrates the importance of paying attention to the brand position.*