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| An increasing amount of information is included on food packs to differentiate products in the marketplace. However, in the few seconds consumers spend evaluating products when making their purchases they do not attend to all the available information. In this context, attentional capture of package features could be vital to better understand what consumers actually focus on when choosing and to ensure that the communication goals are being successfully conveyed. The objective of the present work was to study consumers' perception of food packages by means of a combination of projective mapping and a mobile eye-tracker tool, using breakfast cereals as case study. Fifty consumers performed a projective mapping task, followed by a description phase, with ten breakfast cereal packages, while wearing a mobile eye-tracker. The video recordings obtained with the eye-tracking were analyzed and the occurrence of fixations within different areas of the packages was counted. These data were linked to the projective mapping positioning and to the generated descriptive terms.Eye-tracking data provided information that enabled a more comprehensive understanding of the results from projective mapping. They allowed identifying the most relevant package features for the categorization, as well as some features that were attended to but were not relevant and characteristics that were used for the categorization but that seemed to be not largely processed. Consumers mainly focused their attention on the information displayed on the front of the packages. However, they did not visually process all the information in this area to the same extent. Product name was the most relevant information that consumers attended to for categorization. Most of the information that was not relevant for consumers' categorization did not capture consumers' attention; however a large proportion of the consumers fixated their gaze on brand information but did not use it to locate samples on the map or to describe products. Eye-tracking also highlighted some practical aspects that have not been previously considered on projective mapping studies, particularly from a cognitive perspective.  |