Supplementary Material

Consumers' Acceptance of Meat Products Derived from Male Layer-Type Chickens – A Pilot Study

The numbering of the supplementary statistical tables corresponds to the question numbers used in the manuscript. Tables with the same number but different letter suffixes (e.g., S11A and S11B) present different analyses of the same question.

Note on the original questionnaire and data included in the analysis

The complete original questionnaire and its English translation are presented in a single bilingual table (Supplementary Questionnaire S1), with the original Bulgarian wording and the corresponding English translation in parallel columns. The original question wording, response options, section structure, and numbering have been preserved.

Participants tasted both products before completing the questionnaire. The printed order of the questions does not necessarily reflect the chronological order of the tasting and subsequent responses.

Not all questions from the original questionnaire were included in the present publication. Furthermore, as some respondents did not answer every question, statistical analyses were based on the available valid responses, resulting in different sample sizes across questions and analyses.

Supplementary Questionnaire S1. Original Bulgarian questionnaire and English translation

Questionnaire title (Bulgarian): Анкета за оценка на качеството на продукти от пилешко месо – пушено пиле и пастет по проект Иновамеспро, финансиран от ФНИ

Questionnaire title (English): Questionnaire for assessing the quality of chicken meat products – smoked chicken and pâté, under the Innovamespro project, funded by the National Science Fund

I. Въпроси от общ характер / I. General questions

№	S1 — Български оригинал	S2 — English translation
1	Пол: □ мъж; □ жена	Sex: □ male; □ female
2	Възраст (години): _____	Age (years): _____
3	Образование: □ ученик; □ основно; □ средно; □ висше	Education: □ school pupil; □ primary; □ secondary; □ higher
4	Семейно положение: □ непълнолетен; □ неженен (неомъжена); □ женен (омъжена) или съвместно съжителство; □ разведен(а); □ вдовец (вдовица)	Marital status: □ minor; □ single; □ married or cohabiting; □ divorced; □ widowed
5	Населено място: □ голям град; □ малък град; □ село	Place of residence: □ large city; □ small town; □ village
6	Среден месечен доход на член от семейството (лв.): _____	Average monthly income per family member (BGN): _____

II. Общи въпроси отнасящи се до предпочитанията към видове месни продукти

II. General questions concerning preferences for meat products

№	S1 — Български оригинал	S2 — English translation
1	Консумирате ли месо: □ да; □ не	Do you consume meat? □ yes; □ no
2	Откъде обикновено пазарувате месо: □ супермаркет; □ квартален магазин; □ пазар; □ месарница; □ фермерски магазин (може да посочите повече от един отговор)	Where do you usually buy meat? □ supermarket; □ neighbourhood shop; □ market; □ butcher's shop; □ farm shop (more than one answer may be selected)

3	Какъв вид месо предпочитате: □ свинско; □ телешко; □ агнешко (овче); □ птиче; □ козе; □ друго	What type of meat do you prefer? □ pork; □ beef/veal; □ lamb/mutton; □ poultry; □ goat; □ other
4	Какъв вид птиче месо предпочитате: □ пилешко; □ пуешко; □ патешко; □ пъдпъдъци; □ друго	What type of poultry meat do you prefer? □ chicken; □ turkey; □ duck; □ quail; □ other
5	Какви продукти от пилешко месо предпочитате: □ цяло пиле; □ филе (гърди); □ бут; □ крилца; □ пастет; □ друго	Which chicken products do you prefer? □ whole chicken; □ fillet (breast); □ leg; □ wings; □ pâté; □ other
6	В какво състояние закупувате пилешките продукти: □ прясно (охладено); □ замразено; □ и двата	In what form do you buy chicken products? □ fresh (chilled); □ frozen; □ both
7	Колко често консумирате пилешко месо: □ всеки ден; □ няколко пъти седмично; □ веднъж седмично; □ няколко пъти месечно; □ веднъж месечно; □ по-рядко от веднъж месечно; □ не консумирам пилешко месо	How often do you consume chicken meat? □ every day; □ several times per week; □ once per week; □ several times per month; □ once per month; □ less than once per month; □ I do not consume chicken meat
8	Кой вид пилешки продукт според начина на отглеждане според вас е с по-високо качество: □ бързорастящ бройлер индустриално производство; □ бавнонарастващ бройлер; □ бройлер домашно производство; □ домашно пиле	Which type of chicken product, according to its rearing system, do you consider to be of higher quality? □ fast-growing industrial broiler; □ slow-growing broiler; □ backyard-reared broiler; □ backyard chicken
9	Каква разфасовка на цяло пиле предпочитате: □ до 0,5 кг; □ 0,5–1 кг; □ 1–1,5 кг; □ 1,5–2 кг; □ над 2 кг	What weight of whole chicken do you prefer? □ up to 0.5 kg; □ 0.5–1 kg; □ 1–1.5 kg; □ 1.5–2 kg; □ over 2 kg
10	От кои фактори се влияете при закупуване на пилешко месо: □ срок на годност; □ вкус; □ страна на произход; □ крехкост; □ миризма; □ метод на отглеждане; □ текстура; □ начин на хранене на птиците; □ цвят; □ цена; □ име на производителя; □ място на закупуване; □ тегло; □ опаковка; □ хуманно отношение към животните (може да посочите до пет отговора)	Which factors influence you when buying chicken meat? □ shelf life; □ taste; □ country of origin; □ tenderness; □ smell; □ rearing method; □ texture; □ feeding of the birds; □ colour; □ price; □ producer's name; □ place of purchase; □ weight; □ packaging; □ animal welfare (select up to five answers)
11	Бихте ли платили по-висока цена за по-добро качество: □ да; □ не	Would you pay a higher price for better quality? □ yes; □ no
12	Бихте ли предпочели български пред вносен птичи продукт: □ да, при всички случаи; □ само ако е с по-добро или еднакво качество с вносния; □ не, при всички случаи	Would you prefer a Bulgarian poultry product over an imported one? □ yes, in all cases; □ only if its quality is better than or equal to that of the imported product; □ no, in all cases

III. Въпроси свързани с предлаганите в нашата анкета пилешки продукти

III. Questions about the chicken products offered in this survey

№	S1 — Български оригинал	S2 — English translation
1	Какво е мнението ви за съществуващата практика за умъртвяване на мъжките пилета яйценосно направление на еднодневна възраст: □ не я одобрявам; □ нямам отношение; □ одобрявам я	What is your opinion of the existing practice of culling day-old male chicks of layer-type breeds? □ I do not approve; □ I have no opinion; □ I approve

2	Бихте ли се одобрили предложение, което помага за решаването на този проблем? □ да; □ не	Would you approve a proposal that helps solve this problem? □ yes; □ no
3	Смятате ли, че предложеното от екипа на проекта предложение за отглеждането на пилетата за месо е удачно решение на този проблем? □ твърдо да; □ по-скоро да; □ не мога да реша; □ по-скоро не; □ твърдо не	Do you consider the project team's proposal to raise the chicks for meat to be an appropriate solution to this problem? □ definitely yes; □ rather yes; □ cannot decide; □ rather no; □ definitely no
4	Органолептично оценка на предлаганите продукти (9 бална скала). Оценка 9 – най-висока, 1 – най-ниска. Продукти: Пушено пиле; Пилешки пастет. Показатели: Външен вид; Консистенция; Мирис; Крехкост; Цвят; Вкус; Обща оценка.	Sensory evaluation of the products offered (9-point scale; 9 = highest, 1 = lowest). Products: smoked chicken; chicken pâté. Attributes: appearance; consistency; smell; tenderness; colour; taste; overall score.
5	Сравнете качеството на продуктите от анкетата с други подобни, които обикновено пазарувате. 5.1 Пушено пиле; 5.2 Пилешки пастет. За всеки: □ много по-добро; □ по-добро; □ няма разлика; □ по-лошо; □ много по-лошо; □ не съм консумирал подобен продукт	Compare the quality of the survey products with similar products you usually buy. 5.1 Smoked chicken; 5.2 Chicken pâté. For each: □ much better; □ better; □ no difference; □ worse; □ much worse; □ I have not consumed a similar product
6	Каква цена бихте платили за предложените продукти и колко често бихте ги купували? 6.1 Пушено пиле; 6.2 Пилешки пастет. Вж. матрицата по-долу.	What price would you pay for the products offered, and how often would you buy them? 6.1 Smoked chicken; 6.2 Chicken pâté. See the matrix below.

Note: The sensory evaluation in Question 4 of Section III (Q16 in the manuscript) was performed using a nine-point hedonic scale. The verbal descriptors explained orally to participants in Bulgarian corresponded to the following English equivalents: 9 = "like extremely"; 8 = "like very much"; 7 = "like moderately"; 6 = "like slightly"; 5 = "neither like nor dislike"; 4 = "dislike slightly"; 3 = "dislike moderately"; 2 = "dislike very much"; and 1 = "dislike extremely". These descriptors are provided as an explanatory translation of the scale used in the survey.

III.4 — Sensory evaluation / Органолептична оценка

Продукт / Product	Външен вид / Appearance	Консистенция / Consistency	Мирис / Smell	Крехкост / Tenderness	Цвят / Colour	Вкус / Taste	Обща оценка / Overall
Пушено пиле / Smoked chicken							
Пилешки пастет / Chicken pâté							

III.6 — Price × purchase frequency matrices / Матрици цена × честота

The original form contains the same matrix for 6.1 smoked chicken and 6.2 chicken pâté. Prices are expressed per kg in BGN; overlapping printed boundaries are preserved.

6.1 Пушено пиле / Smoked chicken

Честота / Frequency	до 6 / up to 6	6–9	9–12	12–15	15–20	20–25	над 25 / over 25
Няколко пъти седмично / Several times per week							
Веднъж седмично / Once per week							
Няколко пъти месечно /							

Several times per month							
Веднъж месечно / Once per month							
Веднъж на няколко месеца / Once every few months							
По-рядко от веднъж на няколко месеца / Less than once every few months							
Никога / Never							

6.2 Пилешки пастет / Chicken pâté

Честота / Frequency	до 6 / up to 6	6–9	9–12	12–15	15–20	20–25	над 25 / over 25
Няколко пъти седмично / Several times per week							
Веднъж седмично / Once per week							
Няколко пъти месечно / Several times per month							
Веднъж месечно / Once per month							
Веднъж на няколко месеца / Once every few months							
По-рядко от веднъж на няколко месеца / Less than once every few months							
Никога / Never							

Supplementary Table S7. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and meat consumption (Q7).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Yes n/N (%)	Statistical test	Regression coefficient (β)	Raw *p*-value	FDR - adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	22/24 (91.67)	Fisher exact		1.0000	1.0000
	Male	23/25 (92.00)				
	Total	45/49 (91.84)				
Education	Secondary	22/24 (91.67)	Fisher exact		1.0000	1.0000
	Higher	21/22 (95.45)				
	Total	43/46 (93.48)				
Marital status	Single	14/15 (93.33)	Fisher exact		0.0833	0.4998
	Married	19/19 (100.00)				
	Divorced	6/8 (75.00)				
	Widowed	4/4 (100.00)				
	Total	43/46 (93.48)				
Place of residence	Large city	22/25 (88.00)	Fisher exact		0.8150	1.0000
	Small town	14/15 (93.33)				
	Village	8/8 (100.00)				
	Total	44/48 (91.67)				
Exact age (years)	—	33/36 (91.67)	Binary logistic regression	0.0481	0.1920	0.5760
Exact income (€)	—	33/35(94.29)	Binary logistic regression	0.0012	0.6189	1.0000

Note: Values are presented as the number of affirmative responses divided by the number of valid responses (n/N) and the corresponding percentage. Fisher's exact test was used for categorical sociodemographic factors, whereas binary logistic regression was applied to exact age and income. Regression coefficients (β) represent changes in log-odds per unit increase in the predictor. The *p*-values for logistic regression were obtained from the likelihood-ratio test (Whole Model Test in JMP). FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the six tests performed for Q7. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S8. Association between sociodemographic characteristics and frequency of meat consumption.

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Every day, n (%)	Several times/ week, n (%)	Once/ week, n (%)	Several times/ month, n (%)	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	*p*-value	FDR *p*-value
Gender	Female	2 (9.09)	10 (45.45)	8 (36.36)	2 (9.09)	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.6828	0.9894
	Male	2 (8.70)	13 (56.52)	5 (21.74)	3 (13.04)				
	total	4 (8.89)	23 (51.11)	13 (28.89)	5 (11.11)				
Education	Secondary	2 (9.09)	12 (54.55)	4 (18.18)	4 (18.18)	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.9894	0.9894
	Higher	2 (9.52)	10 (47.62)	8 (38.10)	1 (4.76)				
	total	4 (9.30)	22 (51.16)	12 (27.91)	5 (11.63)				
Marital status	Single	1 (7.14)	8 (57.14)	3 (21.43)	2 (14.29)	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.9131	0.9894
	Married	1 (5.26)	9 (47.37)	7 (36.84)	2 (10.53)				
	Divorced	1 (16.67)	3 (50.00)	1 (16.67)	1 (16.67)				
	Widowed	1 (25.00)	1 (25.00)	2 (50.00)	0 (0.00)				
	total	4 (9.30)	21 (48.84)	13 (30.23)	5 (11.63)				
Place of residence	Large city	2 (9.09)	11 (50.00)	5 (22.73)	4 (18.18)	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.8021	0.9894
	Small town	2 (14.29)	6 (42.86)	5 (35.71)	1 (7.14)				
	Village	0 (0.00)	4 (50.00)	3 (37.50)	1 (12.50)				
	total	4 (9.09)	21 (47.73)	13 (29.55)	6 (13.64)				
Exact age (years)		3 (9.09)	16 (48.49)	8 (24.24)	6 (18.18)	Spearman correlation	$\rho = 0.3672$	0.0356	0.2136
Exact income (€)		2 (6.06)	18 (54.55)	8 (24.24)	5 (15.15)	Spearman correlation	$\rho = 0.1384$	0.4423	0.9894

Note: Values are presented as frequencies (n) and percentages (%) calculated from valid responses within each sociodemographic group. The Mann–Whitney U test and Kruskal–Wallis test were used to compare ordinal response distributions between two and multiple independent groups, respectively. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with age and income as continuous variables. Raw *p*-values were adjusted using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the six tests performed for Q8. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S9. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and preferred whole-chicken weight (Q9).

Sociodemo-graphic factor	Group	≤ 0.5 kg, n (%)	0.5–<1.0 kg, n (%)	1.0–<1.5 kg g, n (%)	1.5–2.0 kg, n (%)	>2.0 kg, n (%)	Test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	1 (4.55)	3 (13.64)	11 (50.00)	4 (18.18)	3 (13.64)	Mann–Whitney U		0.1329	0.2658
	Male	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (52.38)	6 (28.57)	4 (19.05)				
	Total	1 (2.33)	3 (6.98)	22 (51.16)	10 (23.26)	7 (16.28)				
Education	Secondary	1 (4.76)	1 (4.76)	10 (47.62)	6 (28.57)	3 (14.29)	Mann–Whitney U		0.9567	0.9567
	Higher	0 (0.00)	2 (9.52)	11 (52.38)	4 (19.05)	4 (19.05)				
	Total	1 (2.38)	3 (7.14)	21 (50.00)	10 (23.81)	7 (16.67)				
Marital status	Single	0 (0.00)	2 (15.38)	4 (30.77)	4 (30.77)	3 (23.08)	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0849	0.2547
	Married	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (57.89)	4 (21.05)	4 (21.05)				
	Divorced	1 (16.67)	1 (16.67)	4 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)				
	Widowed	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (75.00)	1 (25.00)	0 (0.00)				
	Total	1 (2.38)	3 (7.14)	22 (52.38)	9 (21.43)	7 (16.67)				
Place of residence	Large city	1 (4.55)	3 (13.64)	10 (45.45)	3 (13.64)	5 (22.73)	Kruskal–Wallis		0.9527	0.9567
	Small town	0 (0.00)	1 (7.69)	7 (53.85)	3 (23.08)	2 (15.38)				
	Village	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	5 (62.50)	3 (37.50)	0 (0.00)				
	Total	1 (2.33)	4 (9.30)	22 (51.16)	9 (20.93)	7 (16.28)				
Exact age (years)		1 (3.13)	4 (12.50)	21 (65.63)	6 (18.75)	0 (0.00)	Spearman correlation	ρ = 0.3896	0.0275	0.1650
Exact income (€)		1 (3.13)	2 (6.25)	20 (62.50)	7 (21.88)	2 (6.25)	Spearman correlation	ρ = 0.2062	0.2576	0.3864

Note: Values are presented as frequencies (n) and percentages (%) calculated from valid responses within each sociodemographic group. The Mann–Whitney U test and Kruskal–Wallis test were used to compare ordinal response distributions between two and multiple independent groups, respectively. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with exact age and income. Raw *p*-values were adjusted using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the six tests performed for Q9. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S10. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and willingness to pay more for higher-quality meat (Q10).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Yes n/N (%)	Statistical test	Regression coefficient (β)	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	20/22 (90.91)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	Male	21/23 (91.30)				
	total	41/45 (91.11)				
Education	Secondary	18/22 (81.82)	Fisher exact test		0.1078	0.3233
	Higher	21/21(100.00)				
	total	39/43 (90.70)				
Marital status	Single	13/14 (92.86)	Fisher exact test		0.8739	1.0000
	Married	17/19 (89.47)				
	Divorced	5/6 (83.33)				
	Widowed	4/4 (100.00)				
	total	39/43 (90.70)				
Place of residence	Large city	19/22 (86.36)	Fisher exact test		0.6863	1.0000
	Small town	12/14 (85.71)				
	Village	8/8 (100.00)				
	total	39/44 (88.64)				
Exact age (years)	—	28/33 (84.85)	Binary logistic regression	0.0944	0.0122	0.0734
Exact income (€)	—	29/33 (87.88)	Binary logistic regression	0.0012	0.5040	1.0000

Note: Values are presented as the number of affirmative responses divided by the number of valid responses (n/N) and the corresponding percentage. Fisher's exact test was used for categorical sociodemographic factors, while binary logistic regression was applied to exact age and income as continuous variables. Regression coefficients (β) represent changes in log-odds per unit increase in the predictor. Raw *p*-values for logistic regression were obtained from the Whole Model Test in JMP Pro 17. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the six tests performed for Q10. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S11.

(A) Mean normalized preference scores for chicken products according to sociodemographic characteristics

Sociodemographic factor	Group	N	Whole chicken	Breast	Legs	Wings	Pâté	Other
Gender	Female	22	0.515	0.295	0.061	0.030	0.053	0.045
	Male	23	0.594	0.246	0.101	0.043	0.014	0.000
	total	45	0.556	0.270	0.081	0.037	0.033	0.022
Education	Secondary	22	0.462	0.333	0.083	0.076	0.045	0.000
	Higher	21	0.683	0.159	0.087	0.000	0.023	0.048
	total	43	0.570	0.248	0.085	0.039	0.035	0.023
Marital status	Single	14	0.417	0.476	0.060	0.024	0.024	0.000
	Married	19	0.614	0.193	0.096	0.053	0.044	0.000
	Divorced	6	0.500	0.167	0.167	0.000	0.000	0.167
	Widowed	4	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	total	43	0.570	0.264	0.085	0.031	0.027	0.023
Place of residence	Large city	22	0.417	0.280	0.197	0.023	0.038	0.045
	Small town	14	0.595	0.333	0.024	0.024	0.024	0.000
	Village	8	0.875	0.063	0.000	0.063	0.000	0.000
	total	44	0.557	0.258	0.106	0.030	0.027	0.023
Exact age (years)	—	33	0.621	0.212	0.106	0.030	0.000	0.030
Exact income (€)	—	33	0.626	0.247	0.086	0.030	0.010	0.000

Note: Values represent mean normalized preference scores for each chicken product within the corresponding sociodemographic group. Individual respondents' preference scores were normalized to sum to one across the six product categories. N indicates the number of respondents with valid data. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses.

(B) Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and normalized preferences for chicken parts and products (Q11)

Factor	Product	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Whole chicken	Mann–Whitney U		0.5648	0.9373
	Breast			0.9797	0.9925
	Legs			0.4307	0.8135
	Wings			0.9816	0.9925
	Pâté			0.2795	0.6788
	Other			0.3281	0.6983
Education	Whole chicken	Mann–Whitney U		0.1164	0.5253
	Breast			0.1545	0.5253
	Legs			0.9678	0.9925
	Wings			0.0454	0.4760
	Pâté			0.3722	0.7444
	Other			0.3286	0.6983
Marital status	Whole chicken	Kruskal–Wallis		0.1374	0.5253
	Breast			0.0560	0.4760
	Legs			0.8565	0.9707
	Wings			0.7666	0.9386
	Pâté			0.7730	0.9386
	Other			0.1038	0.5253
Place of residence	Whole chicken	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0485	0.4760
	Breast			0.2536	0.6633
	Legs			0.0980	0.5253
	Wings			0.7421	0.9386
	Pâté			0.6829	0.9386
	Other			0.6065	0.9373
Exact age (years)	Whole chicken	Spearman correlation	ρ = 0.4055	0.0192	0.4760
	Breast		ρ = –0.2631	0.1391	0.5253
	Legs		ρ = –0.2206	0.2174	0.6633
	Wings		ρ = –0.1201	0.5054	0.9044
	Pâté		NA	NA	NA
	Other		ρ = –0.0557	0.7580	0.9386
Exact income (€)	Whole chicken	Spearman correlation	ρ = 0.0017	0.9925	0.9925
	Breast		ρ = –0.0424	0.8149	0.9554
	Legs		ρ = 0.2111	0.2382	0.6633
	Wings		ρ = –0.0872	0.6924	0.9386
	Pâté		ρ = 0.0934	0.6053	0.9373
	Other		NA	NA	NA

Note: The Mann–Whitney U test and Kruskal–Wallis test were used to assess differences in normalized preference scores between two and multiple independent sociodemographic groups, respectively. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with age and income as continuous variables. Raw *p*-values were adjusted using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the 34 evaluable tests for Q11. NA indicates that the correlation could not be calculated because of insufficient variability. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S12. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and perceived meat quality according to chicken type and rearing system (Q12).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Chicken type	Yes n/N (%)	Test	Regression coefficient (β)	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
gender	female	Fast-growing broiler commercially reared	2/22 (9.09)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	male		2/22 (9.09)				
	total		4/44 (9.09)				
gender	female	Slow growing broiler	1/22 (4.55)	Fisher exact test		1.000	1.0000
	male		2/22 (9.09)				
	total		3/44 (6.82)				
gender	female	Backyard broiler	6/22 (27.27)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	male		7/22 (31.82)				
	total		13/44 (29.55)				
gender	female	Backyard chicken	13/22 (59.09)	Fisher exact test		0.7626	1.0000
	male		11/22 (50.00)				
	total		24/44 (54.55)				
Education	secondary	Fast-growing broiler commercially reared	2/21 (9.52)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	higher		1/21 (4.76)				
	total		3/42 (7.14)				
Education	secondary	Slow growing broiler	1/21 (4.76)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	higher		2/21 (9.52)				
	total		3/42 (7.14)				
Education	secondary	Backyard broiler	7/21 (33.33)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	higher		6/21 (28.57)				
	total		13/42 (30.95)				
Education	secondary	Backyard chicken	11/21 (52.38)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	higher		12/21 (57.14)				
	total		23/42 (54.76)				
Marital status	single	Fast-growing broiler commercially reared	0/13 (0.00)	Fisher exact test		0.5482	0.8987
	married		2/19 (10.53)				
	divorced		1/6 (16.67)				
	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
	total		3/42 (7.14)				
Marital status	single	Slow growing broiler	1/13 (7.69)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	married		2/19 (10.53)				
	divorced		0/6 (0.00)				
	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
	total		3/42 (7.14)				
Marital status	single	Backyard broiler	5/13 (38.46)	Fisher exact test		0.1842	0.4019
	married		7/19 (36.84)				
	divorced		0/6 (0.00)				
	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
	total		12/42 (28.57)				
Marital status	single	Backyard chicken	7/13 (53.85)	Fisher exact test		0.1123	0.3369
	married		8/19 (42.11)				
	divorced		5/6 (83.33)				
	widowed		4/4 (100.00)				
	total		24/42 (57.14)				
Place of residence	large city	Fast-growing broiler commercially reared	4/21 (19.05)	Fisher exact test		0.1649	0.3958
	small town		0/14 (0.00)				
	village		0/8 (0.00)				
	total		4/43 (9.30)				
Place of residence	large city	Slow growing broiler	3/21 (14.29)	Fisher exact test		0.2802	0.5604
	small town		0/14 (0.00)				
	village		0/8 (0.00)				
	total		3/43 (6.98)				

Place of residence	large city	Backyard broiler	8/21 (38.10)	Fisher exact test		0.1385	0.3693
	small town		4/14 (28.57)				
	village		0/8 (0.00)				
	total		12/43 (27.91)				
Place of residence	large city	Backyard chicken	6/21 (28.57)	Fisher exact test		0.0006	0.0072
	small town		10/14 (71.43)				
	village		8/8 (100.00)				
	total		24/43 (55.81)				
Exact age (years)		Fast-growing broiler commercially reared	4/33 (12.12)	Binary Logistic regression	–0.0688	0.0642	0.3369
Exact age (years)		Slow growing broiler	3/33 (9.09)		–0.0707	0.0975	0.3369
Exact age (years)		Backyard broiler	3/33 (9.09)		–0.0707	0.0975	0.3369
Exact age (years)		Backyard chicken	23/33 (69.70)		0.1052	0.0005	0.0072
Exact income (€)		Fast-growing broiler commercially reared	2/32 (6.25)	Binary Logistic regression	0.0012	0.5617	0.8987
Exact income (€)		Slow growing broiler	3/32 (9.38)		–0.0018	0.4048	0.7473
Exact income (€)		Backyard broiler	5/32 (15.63)		0.0027	0.0353	0.2824
Exact income (€)		Backyard chicken	22/32 (68.75)		–0.0018	0.1097	0.3369

Note: Values are presented as the number of affirmative responses divided by the number of valid responses (n/N) and the corresponding percentage. Fisher's exact test was used to assess associations with categorical sociodemographic factors, while binary logistic regression was applied to exact age and income as continuous variables. Regression coefficients (β) represent changes in log-odds per unit increase in the predictor. Raw *p*-values for logistic regression were obtained from the Whole Model Test in JMP Pro 17. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the 24 tests performed for Q12. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S13. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and factors influencing chicken meat purchasing decisions (Q13).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Purchasing factor	Yes n/N (%)	Statistical test	Regression coefficient (β)	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	Shelf-life	12/22 (54.55)	Fisher exact test		0.7683	0.9644
	Male		11/23 (47.83)				
	Female	Flavour	4/22 (18.18)			0.3141	0.9180
	Male		8/23 (34.78)				
	Female	Country of origin	6/22 (27.27)			0.0470	0.5153
	Male		1/23 (4.35)				
	Female	Tenderness	5/22 (22.73)			1.0000	1.000
	Male		6/23 (26.09)				
	Female	Smell	6/22 (27.27)			0.7494	0.9644
	Male		8/23 (34.78)				
	Female	Rearing	7/22 (31.82)			0.5136	0.9307
	Male		5/23 (21.74)				
	Female	Texture	2/22 (9.09)			1.0000	1.0000
	Male		3/23 (13.04)				
	Female	Diet	4/22 (18.18)			0.4140	0.9180
	Male		2/23 (8.70)				
	Female	Colour	10/22 (45.45)			0.1205	0.7316
	Male		5/23 (21.74)				
	Female	Price	10/22 (45.45)			0.7666	0.9644
	Male		9/23 (39.13)				
	Female	Producer	6/22 (27.27)			0.7494	0.9644
	Male		8/23 (34.78)				
	Female	Place of purchase	5/22 (22.73)			0.5136	0.9307
	Male		8/23 (34.78)				
	Female	Weight	5/22 (22.73)			0.0959	0.6984
	Male		1/23 (4.35)				
	Female	Packaging	3/22 (13.64)			0.6652	0.9644
	Male		2/23 (8.70)				
	Female	Animal welfare	0/22 (0.00)			NA	NA
	Male		0/23 (0.00)				
Education	secondary	Shelf-life	11/22 (50.00)	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	higher		11/21 (52.38)				
	secondary	Flavour	8/22 (36.36)			0.1623	0.8469
	higher		3/21 (14.29)				
	secondary	Country of origin	3/22 (13.64)			1.0000	1.000

	higher		3/21 (14.29)			
	secondary	Tenderness	5/22 (22.73)		0.7360	0.9644
	higher		6/21 (28.57)			
	secondary	Smell	6/22 (27.27)		0.5256	0.9307
	higher		8/21 (38.10)			
	secondary	Rearing	7/22 (31.82)		0.7360	0.9644
	higher		5/21 (23.81)			
	secondary	Texture	1/22 (4.55)		0.3449	0.9180
	higher		3/21 (14.29)			
	secondary	Diet	2/22 (9.09)		0.4121	0.9180
	higher		4/21 (19.05)			
	secondary	Colour	6/22 (27.27)		0.5256	0.9307
	higher		8/21 (38.10)			
	secondary	Price	11/22 (50.00)		0.3580	0.9180
	higher		7/21 (33.33)			
	secondary	Producer	7/22 (31.82)		1.0000	1.0000
	higher		7/21 (33.33)			
	secondary	Place of purchase	5/22 (22.73)		0.7360	0.9644
	higher		6/21 (28.57)			
	secondary	Weight	4/22 (18.18)		0.6640	0.9644
	higher		2/21 (9.52)			
	secondary	Packaging	5/22 (22.73)		0.0485	0.5153
	higher		0/21 (0.00)			
	secondary	Animal welfare	0/22(0.00)		NA	NA
	higher		0/21 (0.00)			
Marital status	single	Shelf-life	7/14 (50.00)	Fisher exact test	0.1828	0.8469
	married		8/19 (42.11)			
	divorced		2/6 (33.33)			
	widowed		4/4 (100.00)			
	single	Flavour	3/14 (21.43)		0.7345	0.9644
	married		5/19 (26.32)			
	divorced		1/6 (16.67)			
	widowed		2/4 (50.00)			
	single	Country of origin	1/14 (7.14)		0.0844	0.6984
	married		2/19 (10.53)			
	divorced		3/6 (50.00)			
	widowed		1/4 (25.00)			
	single	Tenderness	4/14 (28.57)		1.0000	1.0000
	married		5/19 (26.32)			
	divorced		1/6 (16.67)			
	widowed		1/4 (25.00)			
	single	Smell	4/14 (28.57)		0.9584	1.0000
	married		7/19 (36.84)			
	divorced		2/6 (33.33)			
	widowed		1/4 (25.00)			
	single	Rearing	2/14 (14.29)		0.0463	0.5153
	married		4/19 (21.05)			
	divorced		3/6 (50.00)			
	widowed		3/4 (75.00)			
	single	Texture	2/14 (14.29)		0.4251	0.9180
	married		1/19 (5.26)			
	divorced		1/6 (16.67)			
	widowed		1/4 (25.00)			
	single	Diet	2/14 (14.29)		0.2039	0.8630
	married		2/19 (10.53)			
	divorced		0/6 (0.00)			
	widowed		2/4 (50.00)			
	single	Colour	2/14 (14.29)		0.1095	0.7160
	married		7/19 (36.84)			
	divorced		4/6 (66.67)			
	widowed		2/4 (50.00)			
	single	Price	5/14 (35.71)		0.6373	0.9644
	married		7/19 (36.84)			
	divorced		4/6 (66.67)			
	widowed		2/4 (50.00)			
	single	Producer	5/14 (35.71)		0.3555	0.9180
	married		7/19 (36.84)			
	divorced		0/6 (0.00)			
	widowed		1/4 (25.00)			
	single	Place of purchase	4/14 (28.57)		0.7932	0.9644
	married		5/19 (26.32)			
	divorced		2/6 (33.33)			

	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
	single	Weight	2/14 (14.29)			0.4695	0.9180
	married		2/19 (10.53)				
	divorced		2/6 (33.33)				
	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
	single	Packaging	2/14 (14.29)			1.0000	1.0000
	married		2/19 (10.53)				
	divorced		1/6 (16.67)				
	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
	single	Animal welfare	0/14 (0.00)			NA	NA
	married		0/19 (0.00)				
	divorced		0/6 (0.00)				
	widowed		0/4 (0.00)				
Place of residence	large city	Shelf-life	11/22 (50.00)	Fisher exact test		0.4752	0.9180
	small town		5/14 (35.71)				
	village		5/8 (62.50)				
	large city	Flavour	5/22 (22.73)			0.7267	0.9644
	small town		3/14 (21.43)				
	village		3/8 (37.50)				
	large city	Country of origin	3/22 (13.64)			0.7440	0.9644
	small town		2/14 (14.29)				
	village		2/8 (25.00)				
	large city	Tenderness	3/22 (13.64)			0.0472	0.5153
	small town		7/14 (50.00)				
	village		1/8 (12.50)				
	large city	Smell	5/22 (22.73)			0.4375	0.9180
	small town		6/14 (42.86)				
	village		3/8 (37.50)				
	large city	Rearing	3/22 (13.64)			0.0307	0.5153
	small town		4/14 (28.57)				
	village		5/8 (62.50)				
	large city	Texture	1/22 (4.55)			0.1893	0.8469
	small town		2/14 (14.29)				
	village		2/8 (25.00)				
	large city	Diet	4/22 (18.18)			0.8412	0.9931
	small town		1/14 (7.14)				
	village		1/8 (12.50)				
	large city	Colour	5/22 (22.73)			0.2318	0.8956
	small town		7/14 (50.00)				
	village		3/8 (37.50)				
	large city	Price	11/22 (50.00)			0.7164	0.9644
	small town		5/14 (35.71)				
	village		3/8 (37.50)				
	large city	Producer	10/22 (45.45)			0.0913	0.6984
	small town		2/14 (14.29)				
	village		1/8 (12.50)				
	large city	Place of purchase	2/22 (9.09)			0.0317	0.5153
	small town		5/14 (35.71)				
	village		4/8 (50.00)				
	large city	Weight	3/22 (13.64)			0.3666	0.9180
	small town		3/14 (21.43)				
	village		0/8 (0.00)				
	large city	Packaging	2/22 (9.09)			0.8412	0.9931
	small town		2/14 (14.29)				
	village		1/8 (12.50)				
	large city	Animal welfare	1/22 (4.55)			1.0000	1.0000
	small town		0/14 (0.00)				
	village		0/8 (0.00)				
Exact age (years)		Shelf-life	20/33 (60.61)	Binary logistic regression	–0.0205	0.3047	0.9180
		Flavour	9/33 (27.27)		0.0058	0.7877	0.9644
		Country of origin	6/33 (18.18)		0.0221	0.3754	0.9180
		Tenderness	11/33 (33.33)		0.0020	0.9239	1.0000
		Smell	13/33 (39.39)		–0.0020	0.9194	1.0000
		Rearing	12/33 (36.36)		0.1068	0.0000612	0.0052
		Texture	5/33 (15.15)		0.0357	0.1890	0.8469
		Diet	5/33 (15.15)		0.0258	0.3355	0.9180
		Colour	14/33 (42.42)		0.0264	0.1851	0.8469
		Price	12/33 (36.36)		0.0179	0.3745	0.9180
		Producer	4/33 (12.12)		0.0218	0.4559	0.9180
		Place of purchase	11/33 (33.33)		0.0235	0.2542	0.9180
		Weight	6/33 (18.18)		–0.0291	0.2764	0.9180

	Packaging	5/33 (15.15)		–0.0007	0.9792	1.0000
	Animal welfare	1/33 (3.03)		Not estimated	NA	NA
Exact income (€)	Shelf-life	18/33 (54.55)	Binary logistic regression	–0.0033	0.0075	0.3188
	Flavour	9/33 (27.27)		–0.0004	0.7749	0.9644
	Country of origin	6/33 (18.18)		–0.0029	0.0986	0.6984
	Tenderness	11/33 (33.33)		0.0006	0.6113	0.9644
	Smell	13/33 (39.39)		0.0001033	0.9190	1.0000
	Rearing	11/33 (33.33)		–0.0004	0.7648	0.9644
	Texture	5/33 (15.15)		0.0004	0.7210	0.9644
	Diet	5/33 (15.15)		–0.0022	0.2132	0.8630
	Colour	14/33 (42.42)		0.0008	0.4200	0.9180
	Price	13/33 (39.39)		0.0008	0.4695	0.9180
	Producer	6/33 (18.18)		0.0010	0.4676	0.9180
	Place of purchase	10/33 (30.30)		0.0008	0.4688	0.9180
	Weight	4/33 (12.12)		–0.0008	0.6509	0.9644
	Packaging	4/33 (12.12)		0.0004	0.7942	0.9644
	Animal welfare	0/33 (0.00)		Not estimated	NA	NA

Note: Yes n/N (%) indicates the number and percentage of respondents selecting each purchase criterion among those with valid data for the corresponding sociodemographic factor. For age and income, N represents the number of observations included in the respective binary logistic regression. Fisher's exact test was used for categorical sociodemographic factors, while binary logistic regression was applied to exact age and income as continuous variables. Regression coefficients (β) represent changes in log-odds per unit increase in the predictor. Raw *p*-values for logistic regression were obtained from the Whole Model Test in JMP Pro 17. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the 85 evaluable tests for Q13. NA indicates that a statistical test could not be performed or a model coefficient could not be estimated. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S14. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and disapproval of the culling of day-old male layer-type chicks (Q14).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Disapproval, n/N (%)	Statistical test	Regression coefficient (β)	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	21/24 (87.50)	Fisher exact	—	0.7019	0.7021
	Male	20/25 (80.00)				
Education	secondary	19/24 (79.17)	Fisher exact	—	0.7021	0.7021
	higher	19/22 (86.36)				
Marital status	single	15/15 (100.00)	Fisher exact	—	0.0563	0.3378
	married	13/19 (68.42)				
	divorced	6/8 (75.00)				
	widowed	4/4 (100.00)				
Place of residence	large city	19/25 (76.00)	Fisher exact	—	0.3937	0.5906
	small town	14/15 (93.33)				
	village	7/8 (87.50)				
Exact age (years)		30/36 (83.33)	Binary Logistic regression	0.0396	0.1308	0.2616
Exact income (€)		30/35 (85.71)	Binary Logistic regression	0.0004	0.0739	0.2217

Note: Values are presented as the number of respondents expressing disapproval divided by the number of valid responses (n/N) and the corresponding percentage. Although three response options were available for Q14, only two were selected: “I do not approve” (coded as 1) and “I do not have an opinion” (coded as 0). No respondents selected “I approve”. Fisher's exact test was used for categorical sociodemographic factors, while binary logistic regression was applied to exact age and income as continuous variables. Regression coefficients (β) represent changes in the log-odds of disapproval per unit increase in the predictor. Raw *p*-values for logistic regression were obtained from the Whole Model Test in JMP Pro 17. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the six tests performed for Q14. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S15. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and support for the proposed alternative to culling day-old male layer-type chicks (Q15).

Sociodemographic factor	Category	Definite yes, n/N (%)	Statistical Test	Regression coefficient (β)	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	20/24 (83.33)	Fisher exact		0.7252	0.8702
	Male	19/25 (76.00)				
Education	secondary	19/24 (79.17)	Fisher exact		1.0000	1.0000
	higher	18/22 (81.82)				
Marital status	single	13/15 (86.67)	Fisher exact		0.2943	0.5886
	married	12/19 (63.16)				
	divorced	7/8 (87.50)				
	widowed	4/4 (100.00)				
Place of residence	large city	22/25 (88.00)	Fisher exact		0.2492	0.5886
	small town	10/15 (66.67)				
	village	6/8 (75.00)				
Exact age (years)		27/36 (75.00)	Binary Logistic regression	0.0243	0.2535	0.5886
Exact income (€)		26/35 (74.29)	Binary Logistic regression	0.0008	0.5432	0.8148

Note: Values are presented as the number of respondents selecting "Definitely yes" divided by the number of valid responses (n/N) and the corresponding percentage. Although five response options were available for Q15, only "Definitely yes" and "Rather yes" were selected. For binary analyses, "Definitely yes" was coded as 1 and "Rather yes" as 0. Fisher's exact test was used for categorical sociodemographic factors, while binary logistic regression was applied to exact age and income as continuous variables. Regression coefficients (β) represent changes in the log-odds of selecting "Definitely yes" per unit increase in the predictor. Raw *p*-values for logistic regression were obtained from the Whole Model Test in JMP Pro 17. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the six tests performed for Q15. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S16.

(A) Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and sensory evaluation scores of smoked chicken (Q16).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Sensory attribute	n	Median	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	Appearance	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.2890	0.9282
	Male	Appearance	20	8.0				
Gender	Female	Texture	20	8.5	Mann–Whitney U		0.3140	0.9282
	Male	Texture	20	8.0				
Gender	Female	Smell	20	9.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.7380	0.9282
	Male	Smell	20	9.0				
Gender	Female	Tenderness	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.7180	0.9282
	Male	Tenderness	20	8.0				
Gender	Female	Colour	20	8.5	Mann–Whitney U		0.7380	0.9282
	Male	Colour	20	8.5				
Gender	Female	Taste	20	9.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.6590	0.9282
	Male	Taste	20	9.0				
Gender	Female	Overall acceptance	16	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.4460	0.9282
	Male	Overall acceptance	15	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Appearance	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.7080	0.9282
	Higher	Appearance	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Texture	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.7230	0.9282
	Higher	Texture	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Smell	19	9.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.1130	0.6780
	Higher	Smell	20	9.0				
Education	Secondary	Tenderness	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.4260	0.9282
	Higher	Tenderness	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Colour	19	9.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.2050	0.9282
	Higher	Colour	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Taste	19	9.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.8460	0.9351
	Higher	Taste	20	9.0				
Education	Secondary	Overall acceptance	15	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.6520	0.9282
	Higher	Overall acceptance	15	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Appearance	13	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0865	0.6055
	Married	Appearance	18	8.0				
	Divorced	Appearance	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Appearance	4	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Texture	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.2587	0.9282
	Married	Texture	18	8.0				

	Divorced	Texture	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Texture	4	9.0				
Marital status	Single	Smell	13	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0041	0.0861
	Married	Smell	18	9.0				
	Divorced	Smell	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Smell	4	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Tenderness	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.3363	0.9282
	Married	Tenderness	18	9.0				
	Divorced	Tenderness	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Tenderness	4	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Colour	13	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.8177	0.9282
	Married	Colour	18	8.5				
	Divorced	Colour	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Colour	4	8.5				
Marital status	Single	Taste	13	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.7359	0.9282
	Married	Taste	18	9.0				
	Divorced	Taste	5	9.0				
	Widowed	Taste	4	8.5				
Marital status	Single	Overall acceptance	9	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.8013	0.9282
	Married	Overall acceptance	13	8.0				
	Divorced	Overall acceptance	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Overall acceptance	4	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Appearance	20	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0032	0.0861
	Small town	Appearance	13	8.0				
	Village	Appearance	8	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Texture	19	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0249	0.3486
	Small town	Texture	13	9.0				
	Village	Texture	8	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Smell	20	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.2489	0.9282
	Small town	Smell	13	9.0				
	Village	Smell	8	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Tenderness	19	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.2655	0.9282
	Small town	Tenderness	13	8.0				
	Village	Tenderness	8	7.5				
Place of residence	Large city	Colour	20	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.4798	0.9282
	Small town	Colour	13	9.0				
	Village	Colour	8	8.5				
Place of residence	Large city	Taste	19	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.7467	0.9282
	Small town	Taste	13	9.0				
	Village	Taste	8	8.5				
Place of residence	Large city	Overall acceptance	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.4569	0.9282
	Small town	Overall acceptance	11	8.0				
	Village	Overall acceptance	8	8.0				
Exact age (years)	—	Appearance	31		Spearman correlation	–0.3406	0.0608	0.5107
Exact age (years)	—	Texture	30		Spearman correlation	–0.0127	0.9467	0.9698
Exact age (years)	—	Smell	31		Spearman correlation	–0.3649	0.0436	0.4578
Exact age (years)	—	Tenderness	30		Spearman correlation	0.0746	0.6953	0.9282
Exact age (years)	—	Colour	31		Spearman correlation	0.0588	0.7532	0.9282
Exact age (years)	—	Taste	30		Spearman correlation	0.0613	0.7475	0.9282
Exact age (years)	—	Overall acceptance	31		Spearman correlation	–0.1599	0.3901	0.9282
Exact income (€)	—	Appearance	30		Spearman correlation	–0.0044	0.9814	0.9814
Exact income (€)	—	Texture	30		Spearman correlation	–0.0147	0.9385	0.9698
Exact income (€)	—	Smell	30		Spearman correlation	–0.0246	0.8975	0.9665
Exact income (€)	—	Tenderness	30		Spearman correlation	0.2182	0.2467	0.9282
Exact income (€)	—	Colour	30		Spearman correlation	0.1258	0.5076	0.9282
Exact income (€)	—	Taste	30		Spearman correlation	0.0662	0.7283	0.9282
Exact income (€)	—	Overall acceptance	28		Spearman correlation	–0.0488	0.8053	0.9282

Note: Sensory attributes were evaluated using a 9-point hedonic scale (1 = dislike extremely; 9 = like extremely). Values are presented as the number of valid observations (n) and median sensory scores for each sociodemographic group. The Mann–Whitney U test was used for comparisons by gender and education, while the Kruskal–Wallis test was applied to marital status and place of residence. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with exact age and income as continuous variables. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the 42 comparisons performed for smoked chicken. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. For Spearman correlations, n represents the number of valid paired observations. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

(B) Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and sensory evaluation scores of chicken pâté (Q16).

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Sensory attribute	n	Median	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	Appearance	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.4217	0.9123
	Male	Appearance	20	8.0				
Gender	Female	Texture	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.1157	0.9123
	Male	Texture	20	7.0				
Gender	Female	Smell	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		1.0000	1.0000
	Male	Smell	20	8.5				
Gender	Female	Tenderness	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.8329	0.9719
	Male	Tenderness	19	8.0				
Gender	Female	Colour	20	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.6670	0.9458
	Male	Colour	20	8.0				
Gender	Female	Flavour	20	9.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.8430	0.9719
	Male	Flavour	20	9.0				
Gender	Female	Overall acceptance	16	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.1644	0.9123
	Male	Overall acceptance	15	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Appearance	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.3248	0.9123
	Higher	Appearance	20	7.0				
Education	Secondary	Texture	19	7.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.6418	0.9458
	Higher	Texture	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Smell	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.4204	0.9123
	Higher	Smell	20	9.0				
Education	Secondary	Tenderness	18	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.4125	0.9123
	Higher	Tenderness	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Colour	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.9644	0.9879
	Higher	Colour	20	8.0				
Education	Secondary	Flavour	19	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.3449	0.9123
	Higher	Flavour	20	9.0				
Education	Secondary	Overall acceptance	15	8.0	Mann–Whitney U		0.4874	0.9123
	Higher	Overall acceptance	15	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Appearance	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.5338	0.9123
	Married	Appearance	18	7.0				
	Divorced	Appearance	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Appearance	4	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Texture	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.5865	0.9123
	Married	Texture	18	7.0				
	Divorced	Texture	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Texture	4	8.5				
Marital status	Single	Smell	13	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.5341	0.9123
	Married	Smell	18	8.0				
	Divorced	Smell	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Smell	4	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Tenderness	12	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.5153	0.9123
	Married	Tenderness	18	8.5				
	Divorced	Tenderness	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Tenderness	4	8.0				
Marital status	Single	Colour	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.9025	0.9719
	Married	Colour	18	8.0				
	Divorced	Colour	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Colour	4	8.5				
Marital status	Single	Flavour	13	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.9472	0.9879
	Married	Flavour	18	9.0				
	Divorced	Flavour	5	9.0				
	Widowed	Flavour	4	8.5				
Marital status	Single	Overall acceptance	9	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.4615	0.9123
	Married	Overall acceptance	13	8.0				
	Divorced	Overall acceptance	5	8.0				
	Widowed	Overall acceptance	4	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Appearance	20	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.8109	0.9719
	Small town	Appearance	13	8.0				
	Village	Appearance	8	7.5				
Place of residence	Large city	Texture	19	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.4293	0.9123
	Small town	Texture	13	7.0				

	Village	Texture	8	7.5				
Place of residence	Large city	Smell	20	8.5	Kruskal–Wallis		0.6756	0.9458
	Small town	Smell	13	8.0				
	Village	Smell	8	8.5				
Place of residence	Large city	Tenderness	18	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.1131	0.9123
	Small town	Tenderness	13	8.0				
	Village	Tenderness	8	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Colour	20	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.7113	0.9637
	Small town	Colour	13	8.0				
	Village	Colour	8	8.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Flavour	19	9.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.3889	0.9123
	Small town	Flavour	13	8.0				
	Village	Flavour	8	9.0				
Place of residence	Large city	Overall acceptance	13	8.0	Kruskal–Wallis		0.0982	0.9123
	Small town	Overall acceptance	11	8.0				
	Village	Overall acceptance	8	8.0				
Exact age (years)	—	Appearance	31		Spearman correlation	0.3004	0.1006	0.9123
Exact age (years)	—	Texture	30		Spearman correlation	0.1214	0.5227	0.9123
Exact age (years)	—	Smell	31		Spearman correlation	0.0281	0.8807	0.9719
Exact age (years)	—	Tenderness	30		Spearman correlation	0.2314	0.2185	0.9123
Exact age (years)	—	Colour	31		Spearman correlation	0.3503	0.0534	0.9123
Exact age (years)	—	Flavour	30		Spearman correlation	0.1829	0.3333	0.9123
Exact age (years)	—	Overall acceptance	31		Spearman correlation	0.2055	0.2675	0.9123
Exact income (€)	—	Appearance	30		Spearman correlation	–0.1084	0.5687	0.9123
Exact income (€)	—	Texture	30		Spearman correlation	0.1220	0.5206	0.9123
Exact income (€)	—	Smell	30		Spearman correlation	0.0529	0.7814	0.9719
Exact income (€)	—	Tenderness	30		Spearman correlation	0.2529	0.1775	0.9123
Exact income (€)	—	Colour	30		Spearman correlation	0.1082	0.5691	0.9123
Exact income (€)	—	Flavour	30		Spearman correlation	0.0314	0.8690	0.9719
Exact income (€)	—	Overall acceptance	28		Spearman correlation	0.0597	0.7627	0.9719

Note: Sensory attributes were evaluated using a 9-point hedonic scale (1 = dislike extremely; 9 = like extremely). Values are presented as the number of valid observations (n) and median sensory scores for each sociodemographic group. The Mann–Whitney U test was used for comparisons by gender and education, while the Kruskal–Wallis test was applied to marital status and place of residence. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with exact age and income as continuous variables. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure across the 42 comparisons performed for chicken pâté. Differences in sample sizes reflect missing responses. For Spearman correlations, n represents the number of valid paired observations. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S17.

(A) Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and perceived comparative quality of smoked chicken (Q17)

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Much better, n/N (%)	Better, n/N (%)	No difference, n/N (%)	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	9/20 (45.00)	11/20 (55.00)	0	Fisher exact test		1.0000	1.0000
	Male	7/16 (43.75)	9/16 (56.25)	0				
Education	Secondary	10/17 (58.82)	7/17 (41.18)	0	Fisher exact test		0.1811	0.7416
	Higher	6/18 (33.33)	12/18 (66.67)	0				
Marital status	Single	8/12 (66.67)	4/12 (33.33)	0	Fisher exact test		0.2472	0.7416
	Married	6/15 (40.00)	9/15 (60.00)	0				
	Divorced	1/5 (20.00)	4/5 (80.00)	0				
	Widowed	1/4 (25.00)	3/4 (75.00)	0				
Place of residence	Large city	9/18 (50.00)	9/18 (50.00)	0	Fisher exact test		0.6199	0.8019
	Small town	5/11 (45.45)	6/11 (54.55)	0				
	Village	2/8 (25.00)	6/8 (75.00)	0				

Exact age (years)	—	9	19	0	Spearman rank correlation	–0.0901	0.6486	0.8019
Exact income (€)	—	9	18	0	Spearman rank correlation	0.0864	0.6682	0.8019

(B) Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and perceived comparative quality of chicken pâté (Q17)

Sociodemographic factor	Group	Much better, n/N (%)	Better, n/N (%)	No difference, n/N (%)	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	9/20 (45.00)	10/20 (50.00)	1/20 (5.00)	Fisher exact test		0.8669	0.8669
	Male	6/16 (37.50)	9/16 (56.25)	1/16 (6.25)				
Education	Secondary	8/17 (47.06)	8/17 (47.06)	1/17 (5.88)	Fisher exact test		0.7380	0.8669
	Higher	6/18 (33.33)	11/18 (61.11)	1/18 (5.56)				
Marital status	Single	6/12 (50.00)	5/12 (41.67)	1/12 (8.33)	Fisher exact test		0.8437	0.8669
	Married	7/15 (46.67)	7/15 (46.67)	1/15 (6.67)				
	Divorced	1/5 (20.00)	4/5 (80.00)	0/5 (0.00)				
	Widowed	1/4 (25.00)	3/4 (75.00)	0/4 (0.00)				
Place of residence	Large city	7/18 (38.89)	9/18 (50.00)	2/18 (11.11)	Fisher exact test		0.8607	0.8669
	Small town	4/11 (36.36)	7/11 (63.64)	0/11 (0.00)				
	Village	4/8 (50.00)	4/8 (50.00)	0/8 (0.00)				
Exact age (years)	—	11	17	0	Spearman rank correlation	–0.0948	0.6313	0.8669
Exact income (€)	—	12	15	0	Spearman rank correlation	–0.0546	0.7868	0.8669

Note (Tables S17A and S17B): Comparative product quality was assessed using a five-point ordinal scale (1 = much worse; 2 = worse; 3 = no difference; 4 = better; 5 = much better). Values are presented as the number of responses in each category divided by the number of valid responses (n/N) and the corresponding percentage. Fisher's exact test was used to examine associations with categorical sociodemographic factors, while Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with exact age and income as continuous variables. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure separately for each product across six comparisons. Differences in sample sizes between analyses reflect missing questionnaire responses or missing sociodemographic data. For Spearman correlations, n represents the number of valid paired observations. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S18. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and willingness to pay for smoked chicken and chicken pâté (Q18).

A. Smoked chicken

Sociodemographic factor	Group	n	Median (Q2)	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	22	3.0	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.2270	0.4541
	Male	22	3.0				
Education	Secondary	22	3.0	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.9892	0.9892
	Higher	20	3.0				
Marital status	Single	14	3.0	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.4876	0.5851
	Married	18	3.0				
	Divorced	6	3.0				
	Widowed	4	3.0				
Place of residence	Large city	22	3.0	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.3878	0.5851
	Small town	13	3.0				
	Village	8	3.0				
Exact age (years)	—	32		Spearman	0.3331	0.0624	0.2158
Exact income (€)	—	32		Spearman	0.3224	0.0719	0.2158

B. Chicken pâté

Sociodemographic factor	Group	n	Median (Q2)	Statistical test	Spearman's ρ	Raw *p*-value	FDR-adjusted *p*-value
Gender	Female	22	3.5	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.7133	0.7133
	Male	22	4.0				
Education	Secondary	22	3.5	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.5169	0.6202
	Higher	20	3.5				
Marital status	Single	14	3.5	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.4290	0.6202
	Married	18	3.0				
	Divorced	6	3.5				
	Widowed	4	4.0				
Place of residence	Large city	22	3.0	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.1899	0.5696
	Small town	13	4.0				
	Village	8	4.0				
Exact age (years)	—	32		Spearman	0.7035	7.07×10^{-6}	4.24×10^{-5}
Exact income (€)		32		Spearman	0.1943	0.2866	0.5732

Note: Willingness to pay analyzed using a five-category ordinal scale (1 = < €3.00; 2 = €3.00–4.50; 3 = €4.50–6.00; 4 = €6.00–7.50; 5 = > €7.50). Median (Q2) refers to the numerical response code rather than an exact monetary amount. The two highest price categories in the original questionnaire (BGN 20–25 and above BGN 25) were omitted from the analysis because no responses were recorded in these categories. Consequently, the original BGN 15–20 (€7.50–10.00) interval was presented as > €7.50 in the five-category scale. The Mann–Whitney U test

was used for comparisons by gender and education, while the Kruskal–Wallis test was applied to marital status and place of residence. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with exact age and income as continuous variables. The sample size (n) represents valid observations within each group or valid paired observations for Spearman correlations. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure separately for each product across six comparisons. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table S19. Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and intended purchase frequency of smoked chicken and chicken pâté (Q19).

A. Smoked chicken							
Sociodemographic factor	**Group**	**n**	**Median (Q2)**	**Statistical test**	**Spearman's ρ**	**Raw *p*-value**	**FDR-adjusted *p*-value**
Gender	Female	22	6.0	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.4969	0.7453
	Male	22	6.0				
Education	Secondary	22	6.0	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.8822	0.8822
	Higher	20	6.0				
Marital status	Single	14	6.5	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.2306	0.6917
	Married	18	6.0				
	Divorced	6	7.0				
	Widowed	4	6.0				
Place of residence	Large city	22	6.0	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.3535	0.7071
	Small town	13	6.0				
	Village	8	6.5				
Exact age (years)	—	32		Spearman rank correlation	0.3504	0.0493	0.2958
Exact income (€)	—	32		Spearman rank correlation	0.0504	0.7840	0.8822
B. Chicken pâté							
Sociodemographic factor	**Group**	**n**	**Median (Q2)**	**Statistical test**	**Spearman's ρ**	**Raw *p*-value**	**FDR-adjusted *p*-value**
Gender	Female	22	4.0	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.1655	0.2482
	Male	22	5.0				
Education	Secondary	22	4.0	Mann–Whitney U	—	0.3143	0.3771
	Higher	20	4.0				
Marital status	Single	14	4.0	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.1255	0.2482
	Married	18	4.0				
	Divorced	6	5.5				
	Widowed	4	5.5				
Place of residence	Large city	22	4.0	Kruskal–Wallis	—	0.1060	0.2482
	Small town	13	4.0				
	Village	8	5.0				
Exact age (years)	—	32		Spearman rank correlation	0.5101	0.0029	0.0171
Exact income (€)	—	32		Spearman rank correlation	0.0362	0.8442	0.8442

Note: Intended purchase frequency was recorded on a seven-category ordinal scale (1 = never; 2 = less than once every few months; 3 = once every few months; 4 = once a month; 5 = several times a month; 6 = once a week; 7 = several times a week). Median (Q2) refers to the numerical response code rather than an actual number of purchases. The Mann–Whitney U test was used for comparisons by gender and education, while the Kruskal–Wallis test was applied to marital status and place of residence. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess associations with exact age and income as continuous variables. The sample size (n) represents valid observations within each group or valid paired observations for Spearman correlations. FDR-adjusted *p*-values were calculated using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure separately for each product across six comparisons. Statistical significance was set at FDR-adjusted $p < 0.05$.