



International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry



ISSN: 2456-2912

NAAS Rating (2026): 4.61

VET 2026; SP-11(4): 193-197

© 2026 VET

www.veterinarypaper.com

Received: 12-01-2026

Accepted: 15-02-2026

P Gowtham

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,
Veterinary Dispensary, Vayalur,
Karur, Tamil Nadu, India

Jagannatha Rao B

Associate Professor and Head,
Department of Livestock
Products Technology, Veterinary
College Gadag, Karnataka, India

Keerthika V

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,
Veterinary Dispensary,
Lalapettai, Karur, Tamil Nadu,
India

R Sreeranjani

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,
Veterinary Dispensary,
Ananthapuram, Thoothukudi,
Tamil Nadu, India

V Mozhiarasi

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,
Veterinary Dispensary,
Mettumadhadhanapuram, Karur,
Tamil Nadu, India.

V Varudharajan

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,
Veterinary Dispensary,
Kulithalai, Karur, Tamil Nadu,
India

Corresponding Author:

P Gowtham

Veterinary Assistant Surgeon,
Veterinary Dispensary, Vayalur,
Karur, Tamil Nadu, India

Insights into the consumption pattern, consumer preference and attitude towards meat and meat products in different administrative divisions of Karnataka

P Gowtham, Jagannatha Rao B, Keerthika V, R Sreeranjani, V Mozhiarasi and V Varudharajan

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.22271/veterinary.2026.v11.i4Sc.3216>

Abstract

A study was conducted among participants from four administrative divisions of Karnataka to assess consumer preferences, consumption patterns and awareness related to meat and meat products. The respondents were predominantly middle-aged males, with many engaged in agriculture and belonging to lower income groups. Chicken, particularly skinless and bone-in cuts, emerged as the most preferred meat, followed by mutton, fish, pork and beef. Meat consumption was commonly practiced twice a week, especially on Sundays and Wednesdays, with moderate individual intake levels and typical household expenditure falling within an affordable range. Registered meat shops were the primary source of purchase, while homemade preparations were favored over commercially processed products. The findings indicated no marked seasonal variation in consumption, with a strong inclination toward fresh meat and minimal acceptance of frozen or processed alternatives. Although awareness of food safety regulations such as those implemented by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India was moderate, a considerable proportion of respondents reported experiencing meat-related health issues. These observations highlight the need for targeted educational initiatives and training programs to improve public awareness and promote safe and hygienic practices within the modern meat industry.

Keywords: Consumer preferences, meat consumption patterns, meat products, chicken preference

Introduction

India's meat production has shown steady growth, reaching 8.60 million tonnes, with the poultry sector contributing nearly half of the total output. The country has demonstrated a notable increase in production compared to previous years, reflecting the expanding demand for animal-derived foods. On a global scale, projections by the Food and Agriculture Organization estimate that meat demand will rise substantially, reaching about 455 million metric tonnes by 2050. Furthermore, global consumption of animal protein is expected to increase significantly by 2030, driven mainly by population growth and economic development, with poultry showing the highest anticipated growth among meat sources.

Animal proteins play a crucial role in ensuring balanced nutrition; however, their availability in India remains comparatively low. The per capita supply of protein from animal sources is considerably below the global average. Similarly, the availability of meat per person in India does not meet the dietary recommendations of the Indian Council of Medical Research, indicating a gap between nutritional requirements and actual consumption levels. Despite this, meat has historically been an integral component of Indian diets and changing socio-economic conditions have contributed to a gradual increase in non-vegetarian food consumption. Rising incomes, urbanization and dietary diversification have encouraged higher intake of animal protein, while westernization has also led to increased popularity of processed meat products, particularly among younger populations.

Although meat consumption is increasing, there remains a lack of comprehensive data on

consumer preferences and consumption patterns in India. Understanding consumer behavior is essential for designing region-specific livestock production systems and improving meat marketing strategies. Such insights can support farmers and entrepreneurs in aligning production with market demand while ensuring quality and safety standards (Barbuddhe *et al.*, 2018) [5].

In this context, Karnataka contributes a moderate share to the national meat output and plays a significant role in the livestock sector. Despite this, per capita meat availability in the state remains relatively low, highlighting the need for improved production and consumption strategies. Therefore, the present study was undertaken to evaluate consumer preferences for different types of meat, analyze consumption patterns and assess awareness regarding food safety regulations such as those governed by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India. The study also aims to understand consumer perspectives on meat quality, animal welfare, purchasing behavior, and hygienic practices. The findings are expected to provide valuable insights for meat entrepreneurs to develop products that align with consumer expectations and regional demand.

Materials and Methods

A total of 80 participants were selected using a simple random sampling method. Data regarding socio-demographic characteristics and meat-related preferences were collected individually through a pre-tested structured interview schedule. The collected information was subsequently analyzed and interpreted. For analytical purposes, the respondents were grouped based on four administrative divisions of Karnataka, namely Bengaluru, Belagavi, Kalaburagi and Mysuru.

Results and Discussion

Details pertaining to respondents

The survey population comprised a higher proportion of males than females (Table. 1), with most respondents belonging to the middle-aged category. Households typically consisted of four to six members. A considerable number of participants had completed secondary education and were primarily engaged in agriculture as their main occupation. The majority also fell within the lower income bracket, earning less than one lakh rupees annually.

People's preference on meat and meat parts

Chicken emerged as the most preferred meat among respondents, followed by mutton (Table. 2), fish, pork and beef, while a smaller proportion showed interest in other meat types (Kiran *et al.*, 2018; Muthukumar *et al.*, 2018; Eswara Rao *et al.*, 2017; Reddy and Raju, 2010) [2, 3, 1, 4]. Among chicken cuts, leg pieces were the most favored, followed by breast, wings, back and neck portions. A majority of participants expressed acceptance of both skinless and bone-in chicken. With regard to by-products, liver was identified as the most preferred edible organ in both small ruminants and poultry. The high preference for chicken can be attributed primarily to its palatability, affordability and easy availability in the market.

Consumption pattern of meat and meat products

Respondents commonly reported consuming chicken twice a week (Table. 3), particularly on Sundays and Wednesdays, with many attributing their preference to its perceived

nutritional benefits. Dietary habits were consistent throughout the year, with no noticeable seasonal variation in meat consumption. Monthly individual intake was generally moderate, with most participants consuming between 1 and 2.5 kg, while a smaller proportion consumed less than 1 kg. Household expenditure on meat was typically within an affordable range. Overall, the findings indicate that the majority of respondents consume meat in quantities exceeding the recommendations of the Indian Council of Medical Research.

Purchase mode and preferred meat products

Respondents showed a clear preference for purchasing meat from registered shops (Table. 4), reflecting their inclination toward hygienic and clean sources of procurement. However, when it came to meat products, a greater preference was observed for homemade preparations, particularly dry items such as chilli, tandoori and kebabs, which were perceived as safer, healthier and more reliable. Despite the availability of processed meat products, many participants expressed reluctance to consume them, largely due to their habitual preference for fresh meat (Eswara Rao *et al.*, 2017; Reddy and Raju, 2010) [1, 4].

In terms of quality evaluation, texture was commonly considered an important indicator of good quality meat, while unpleasant odour was widely recognized as a sign of spoilage. Overall, the findings suggest that consumers place strong emphasis on cleanliness, safety and hygienic handling in both meat and meat products.

Awareness among the respondents

Awareness regarding food safety regulations was found to be relatively limited (Table. 5), with less than half of the respondents being familiar with the role of the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India. However, this level of awareness appears comparatively higher than that reported by Singh *et al.* (2019) [6], where consumers in Ludhiana showed minimal knowledge of FSSAI in a large-scale meat survey. Knowledge gaps were also evident in other critical areas, as more than half of the respondents were unaware of antimicrobial resistance in meat products, the functions of the Broiler Coordination Committee and the use of humane practices such as stunning during slaughter.

Perceptions regarding frozen meat were relatively low, with only a minority considering it nutritious. This reflects a strong consumer preference for fresh meat sourced from wet markets. Unlike industrialized countries, where well-established cold chain systems enhance food safety and consumer confidence, awareness and acceptance of cold chain practices in India remain limited (Muthukumar *et al.*, 2018) [3].

Cultural influences were also evident in consumption patterns, as many respondents avoided meat during auspicious periods such as the Shravan month. A notable proportion of participants reported experiencing meat-borne illnesses, while simultaneously acknowledging the nutritional benefits of meat consumption. Awareness regarding issues such as adulteration and slaughter practices was moderate among respondents. Additionally, a majority believed that regular consumption of meat contributes positively to health. Overall, while there is a reasonable understanding of the nutritional importance of meat, the findings indicate a need for further improvement in awareness related to food safety, hygiene and modern meat processing practices.

Table 1: Correspondents' background information

Item	Bengaluru	Belagavi	Kalaburagi	Mysuru	Total
	N=35	N=15	N=15	N=15	N=80
Gender					
Male	20 (57.1)	08 (53.3)	12 (80.0)	08 (53.3)	48 (60.0)
Female	15 (42.9)	07 (46.7)	03 (20.0)	07 (46.7)	32 (40.0)
Age					
35-45	07 (20.0)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	02 (13.3)	14 (17.5)
45-55	19 (54.3)	10 (66.7)	12 (80.0)	10 (66.7)	51 (63.8)
More than 55	09 (25.7)	03 (20.0)	-	03 (20.0)	15 (18.8)
Family size					
Less than 4	09 (25.7)	02 (13.3)	06 (40.0)	04 (26.7)	21 (26.3)
4-6	21 (60.0)	12 (80.0)	09 (60.0)	10 (66.7)	52 (65.0)
More than 6	05 (14.3)	01 (6.7)	-	01 (6.7)	07 (8.8)
Education status					
Primary (upto 4 std)	02 (5.7)	-	03 (20.0)	-	05 (6.3)
Secondary (4- 7)	02 (5.7)	01 (6.7)	-	-	03 (3.8)
High school (8-12)	06 (17.1)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	01 (6.7)	16 (20.0)
Secondary Graduation (college)	12 (34.3)	04 (26.7)	-	07 (46.7)	23 (28.8)
Post graduation	08 (22.9)	01 (6.7)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	18 (22.5)
Illiterate	05 (14.3)	03 (20.0)	03 (20.0)	04 (26.7)	15 (18.8)
Occupation					
Agriculture	17 (48.6)	03 (20.0)	08 (53.3)	07 (46.7)	35 (43.8)
Business	04 (11.4)	03 (20.0)	-	03 (20.0)	10 (12.5)
Govt. employee	10 (28.6)	06 (40.0)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	25 (31.3)
Private	04 (11.4)	03 (20.0)	01 (6.7)	02 (13.3)	10 (12.5)
Annual income					
< 1 lakh	17 (48.6)	06 (33.3)	06 (40.0)	07 (46.7)	35 (43.7)
2-5 lakhs	10 (28.6)	07 (46.7)	03 (20.0)	04 (26.7)	24 (30.0)
5-10 lakhs	05 (14.3)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	03 (20.0)	13 (16.3)
>10 lakhs	03 (8.6)	01 (6.7)	03 (20.0)	01 (6.7)	08 (10.0)

Table 2: People's preference on meat and meat parts

Item	N=35	N=15	N=15	N=15	N=80
	Bengaluru	Belagavi	Kalaburagi	Mysuru	Total
Preferred meat					
Chicken	34 (97.1)	15 (100)	15 (100)	14 (93.3)	78 (97.5)
Mutton	32 (91.4)	13 (86.7)	12 (80.0)	13 (86.7)	70 (87.5)
Pork	21 (60.0)	07 (46.7)	04 (26.7)	08 (53.3)	40 (50.0)
Beef	11 (31.4)	03 (20.0)	02 (13.3)	05 (33.3)	21 (26.3)
Fish	30 (85.7)	10 (66.7)	11 (73.3)	10 (66.7)	61 (76.3)
Others	06 (17.1)	03 (20.0)	-	02 (13.3)	11 (13.8)
Cut up parts preferred					
Leg	35 (100)	15 (100)	15 (100)	14 (93.3)	79 (98.8)
Breast	31 (88.6)	13 (86.7)	12 (80.0)	12 (80.0)	68 (85.0)
Neck	22 (62.9)	08 (53.3)	10 (66.7)	07 (46.7)	47 (58.8)
Wings	28 (80.0)	10 (66.7)	07 (46.7)	09 (60.0)	54 (67.5)
Back	26 (74.3)	07 (46.7)	09 (60.0)	06 (40.0)	48 (60.0)
Preferred chicken meat					
With skin	12 (34.3)	03 (20.0)	04 (26.7)	05 (33.3)	24 (30.0)
Skinless	23 (65.7)	12 (80.0)	11 (73.3)	10 (66.7)	56 (70.0)
With Bone	20 (57.1)	08 (53.3)	06 (40.0)	10 (66.7)	44 (55.0)
Boneless	15 (42.9)	07 (46.7)	09 (60.0)	05 (33.3)	36 (45.0)
Byproducts Mostly preferred Small ruminants					
Blood	03 (8.6)	-	06 (40.0)	04 (26.7)	13 (16.3)
Intestine	09 (25.7)	04 (26.7)	-	01 (6.7)	14 (17.5)
Head	07 (20.0)	02 (13.3)	-	01 (6.7)	10 (12.5)
Brain	04 (11.4)	02 (13.3)	-	02 (13.3)	08 (10.0)
Lung	03 (8.6)	-	-	-	03 (3.8)
Liver	11 (31.4)	07 (46.7)	09 (60.0)	07 (46.7)	34 (42.5)
Chicken					
Liver	28 (80.0)	13 (86.7)	12 (80.0)	12 (80.0)	65 (81.3)
Heart	08 (22.9)	-	01 (6.7)	-	09 (11.3)
Gizzard	03 (8.6)	02 (13.3)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	10 (12.5)

Table 3: Consumption pattern of meat and meat products

Item	Bengaluru	Belagavi	Kalaburagi	Mysuru	N=80
	N=35	N=15	N=15	N=15	Total
Meat preferred days					
Daily	05 (14.3)	-	03 (20.0)	-	08 (10.0)
Twice in a week	21 (60.0)	06 (40.0)	09 (60.0)	09 (60.0)	45 (56.3)
Weekly once	07 (20.0)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	06 (40.0)	22 (27.5)
Monthly once	02 (5.7)	03 (20.0)	-	-	05 (6.3)
Meat preferred days					
Monday	15 (42.9)	08 (53.3)	09 (60.0)	06 (40.0)	38 (47.5)
Tuesday	24 (68.6)	07 (46.7)	07 (46.7)	11 (73.3)	49 (61.3)
Wednesday	26 (74.3)	10 (66.7)	10 (66.7)	13 (86.7)	59 (73.8)
Thursday	21 (60.0)	07 (46.7)	07 (46.7)	09 (60.0)	44 (55.0)
Friday	19 (54.3)	07 (46.7)	11 (73.3)	05 (33.3)	42 (52.5)
Saturday	11 (31.4)	07 (46.7)	09 (60.0)	05 (33.3)	32 (40.0)
Sunday	29 (82.9)	12 (80.0)	13 (86.7)	13 (86.7)	67 (83.8)
All days	09 (25.7)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	02 (13.3)	16 (20.0)
Meat preferred season					
Summer	-	-	-	-	-
winter	04 (11.4)	06 (40.0)	05 (33.3)	02 (13.3)	17 (21.3)
Rainy	03 (8.6)	-	-	-	03 (3.8)
No preference	28 (80.0)	09 (60.0)	10 (66.7)	13 (86.7)	60 (75.0)
Reason for meat consumption					
Taste	08 (22.9)	02 (13.3)	-	03 (20.0)	13 (16.3)
Texture	03 (8.6)	-	-	-	03 (3.3)
Habituated	06 (17.1)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	06 (40.0)	17 (21.3)
Healthy/nutrition	18 (51.4)	10 (66.7)	12 (80.0)	06 (40.0)	46 (57.5)
Availability	-	01 (6.7)	-	-	01 (1.3)
Average expenditure for meat and meat products in a month/ family					
<1000 Rs	10 (28.6)	06 (40.0)	07 (46.7)	01 (6.7)	24 (30.0)
1000 -3000 Rs	17 (48.6)	08 (53.3)	06 (40.0)	11 (73.3)	42 (52.5)
3000- 5000 Rs	04 (11.4)	01 (6.7)	02 (13.3)	02 (13.3)	09 (11.3)
>5000 Rs	04 (11.4)	-	-	01 (6.7)	05 (6.3)
Average meat consumption in a month/ individual					
<1 kg	11 (31.4)	07 (46.7)	06 (40.0)	05 (33.3)	29 (36.3)
1-2.5 kg	19 (54.3)	08 (53.3)	06 (40.0)	07 (46.7)	40 (50.0)
2.5-5 kg	03 (8.6)	-	03 (20.0)	03 (20.0)	09 (11.3)
>5 kg	02 (5.7)	-	-	-	02 (2.5)

Table 4: Purchase mode and preferred meat products

Item	Bengaluru	Belagavi	Kalaburagi	Mysuru	Total
	N=35	N=15	N=15	N=15	N=80
Willing to take meat products from					
Home	22 (62.9)	08 (53.3)	09 (60.0)	14 (93.3)	53 (66.3)
Restaurants	10 (28.6)	07 (46.7)	06 (40.0)	01 (6.7)	24 (30.0)
Fast food shops	03 (8.6)	-	-	-	3 (3.8)
Meat purchase mode					
Registered meat shop	17 (48.6)	10 (66.7)	11 (73.3)	07 (46.7)	45 (56.3)
Roadside shops	13 (37.1)	03 (20.0)	03 (20.0)	05 (33.3)	24 (30.0)
Frozen meat from super market	01 (2.9)	-	-	-	1 (1.3)
Slaughtering in home	04 (11.4)	02 (13.3)	01 (6.7)	03 (20.0)	10 (12.5)
Most preferred meat product					
Gravy	09 (25.7)	03 (20.0)	03 (20.0)	03 (20.0)	18 (22.5)
Dry item (chilli, tandoori, kebab)	15 (42.9)	08 (53.3)	08 (53.3)	09 (60.0)	40 (50.0)
Biryani	11 (31.4)	04 (26.7)	04 (26.7)	03 (20.0)	22 (27.5)
Processed foods willing take due to					
Taste	11 (31.4)	01 (6.7)	02 (13.3)	-	14 (17.5)
Flavor	03 (8.6)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	-	8 (10.0)
Trying new foods	05 (14.3)	04 (26.7)	01 (6.7)	03 (20.0)	13 (16.3)
not willing to take due to					
Fresh meat habituated	12 (34.3)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	06 (40.0)	27 (33.8)
Not healthy	01 (2.9)	-	05 (33.3)	02 (13.3)	8 (10.0)
Not willing to change	02 (5.7)	02 (13.3)	01 (6.7)	01 (6.7)	6 (7.5)
Costly	01 (2.9)	-	-	-	1 (1.3)
Meat quality assessment based on					
Color	12 (34.3)	03 (20.0)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	20 (25.0)
Texture	16 (45.7)	05 (33.3)	07 (46.7)	06 (40.0)	34 (42.5)
People recommendation	05 (14.3)	03 (20.0)	04 (26.7)	03 (20.0)	15 (18.8)
Others	02 (5.7)	04 (26.7)	02 (13.3)	03 (20.0)	11 (13.8)

Meat spoilage assessment based on					
Smell	19 (54.3)	09 (60.0)	06 (40.0)	12 (80.0)	46 (57.5)
Color	03 (8.6)	-	03 (20.0)	-	06 (7.5)
Tasting	12 (34.3)	06 (40.0)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	27 (33.8)
Other	01 (2.9)	-	-	-	01 (1.3)

Table 5: Awareness among the respondents

Knowledge about	Bengaluru	Belagavi	Kalaburagi	Mysuru	Total
Nutritive value of meat	30 (85.7)	12 (80.0)	12 (80.0)	11 (73.3)	65 (81.3)
FSSAI	23 (65.7)	09 (60.0)	06 (40.0)	09 (60.0)	47 (58.8)
Antimicrobial resistance	19 (54.3)	12 (80.0)	06 (40.0)	07 (46.7)	44 (55.0)
Incidence of food poisoning	35 (100)	14 (93.3)	13 (86.7)	09 (60.0)	71 (88.8)
Animal welfare	28 (80.0)	11 (73.3)	09 (60.0)	08 (53.3)	56 (70.0)
Method of slaughter (Halal, jatka)	23 (65.7)	06 (40.0)	11 (73.3)	11 (73.3)	51 (63.8)
Stunning done for meat animals	15 (42.9)	06 (40.0)	06 (40.0)	05 (33.3)	32 (40.0)
Adulteration of meat	23 (65.7)	08 (53.3)	12 (80.0)	08 (53.3)	51 (63.8)
Is Frozen meat healthy	21 (60.0)	06 (40.0)	06 (40.0)	07 (46.7)	40 (50.0)
Broiler coordination committee	12 (34.3)	06 (40.0)	03 (20.0)	04 (26.7)	25 (31.3)
Sravan season meat consumption	19 (54.3)	09 (60.0)	12 (80.0)	06 (40.0)	46 (57.5)
Whether regular consumption of meat is good for human health	28 (80.0)	11 (73.3)	09 (60.0)	11 (73.3)	59 (73.8)

Conclusion

The present study provides valuable insights into consumer perceptions, preferences, and awareness regarding meat and meat products. These findings can assist policymakers and stakeholders in the meat industry in formulating strategies to enhance meat safety, quality, and market efficiency while safeguarding public health. Despite a reasonable understanding of the nutritional importance of meat, gaps in awareness persist, particularly regarding the role of the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India, as well as the benefits of processed and frozen meat products.

The results highlight the need for comprehensive educational interventions aimed at improving consumer knowledge on hygienic practices, food safety standards, and modern meat processing technologies. Strengthening awareness through targeted training programs and extension activities will be essential to promote safe consumption practices and to support the sustainable growth of the meat sector.

Conflict of Interest

Not available

Financial Support

Not available

References

1. Eswara Rao B, Bhaskar K, Naga Mallika E, Naveen Z, Gupta A. Study on consumption pattern of meat in and around rural locality of Gannavaram (Andhra Pradesh). *Chemical Science Review and Letters*. 2017;6(23):1363-1368.
2. Kiran M, Prabhu KN, Paramesha SC, Rajshekar T, Praveen MP, Punitkumar C, *et al*. Consumption pattern, consumer attitude and consumer perception on meat quality and safety in southern India. *International Food Research Journal*. 2018;25(3):1026-1030.
3. Muthukumar M, Ramesh M, Naveena BM, Kulkarni VV. Consumption pattern and purchase behaviour of meat consumers in India. *Journal of Veterinary Public Health*. 2018;15(2):103-111.
4. Reddy MS, Raju DT. Meat consumption pattern in Hyderabad city. *Indian Journal of Animal Research*. 2010;44(4):248-253.
5. Barbuddhe SB, Gadekar Y, Muthukumar M. One health perspective on meat sector. In: *Proceedings of the 10th*

Conference of Indian Meat Science Association (IMSACON-X) and International Symposium on holistic approach to the meat food quality and safety in continuum from farm to fork. Meerut: Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology; 2021. p. 1-7.

6. Singh S, Mehta N, Chatli MK, Malav OP. Consumer studies on meat consumption and processing pattern through contact survey in different zones of Ludhiana city. *Journal of Animal Research*. 2019;9(4):605-611.

How to Cite This Article

Gowtham P, Rao JB, Keerthika V, Sreeranjani R, Mozhiarasi V, Varudharajan V. Insights into the consumption pattern, consumer preference and attitude towards meat and meat products in different administrative divisions of Karnataka. *International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry*. 2026;SP-11(4):193-197.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open-access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.