

Type of manuscript: Article

Title:

Impact of Green Subsidies on Differential Pricing of Agricultural Products

Comments

The authors construct two two-stage models of price differentiation in a duopoly market and solve them for the optimal loyal price and poaching price of the two types of enterprises (producing green agricultural products with green agricultural subsidies, and those producing general agricultural products).

The operation of the models has been verified by numerical simulation (for assumptions adopted in the publication).

The study did not carry out any research on real objects (it would be difficult due to the assumptions made when creating the model).

Thus, one cannot talk about the analysis of the impact of green agricultural subsidies on prices.

One can only talk about the analysis of the behavior of models describing the impact of green subsidies on product prices.

The conclusions stated that (verses 451-454):

"This study examined the pricing and decision-making behaviors of green agricultural product producers and general agricultural product producers, considering government subsidies for green agricultural products, when there are only two kinds of consumers with different preferences for green agricultural products in the market."

In my opinion this statement is unjustified.

The results of tests confirming that real objects (producers, consumers) make decisions in accordance with the model proposed by the authors have not been presented.

The correct sentence would be:

"The study analyzed the operation of the pricing and decision-making behaviors model of green agricultural product producers and general agricultural product producers, considering government subsidies for green agricultural products, (...)."

Specific comments:**Comment 1**

If possible, the authors should improve the readability of Figures 3,4,5,6,7, 8 (size of the font, size of the graph).

Comment 2 - typing errors

Verse 52.

There is “princes” should be “prices”

Comment 3 - bad citation

Verse 47-49. Literature position no. 6 wrongly cited.

“Baranski et al. (2014) believe (...) levels [6].” - should be instead “Baranski et al. [6] believe (...) levels.”

Verse 49. Literature position no. 7 wrongly cited.

“Palupi et al. (2012) also confirmed this through experiments [7].” - should be instead “Palupi et al. [7] also confirmed this through experiments.”

Verse 49-50. Literature position no. 8 wrongly cited.

“Baudry et al. (2017) believe (...) quality [8],” - should be instead “Baudry et al. [8] believe (...) quality,”

Verse 76-78. Literature position no. 19 wrongly cited.

“Wang (2018) et al. found (...) income [19].” - should be instead “Wang et al. [19] found (...) income.”

Verse 89-91. Literature position no. 32 wrongly cited.

“Armstrong and Vickers (2001) studied (...) framework [32].” - should be instead “Armstrong and Vickers [32] studied (...) framework.”

Verse 93. Literature position no. 33-34 wrongly cited.

“[33–34] (Ki-Eun et al. 2016; Gehrig et al., 2006). Ki-Eun (2014) uses a four-stage model” - should be instead “[33–34]. Ki-Eun [33] uses a four-stage model”

Verse 96-98. Literature position no. 36 wrongly cited.

“Li and Jain (2016) studied (...) welfare [36].” - should be instead “Li and Jain [36] studied (...) welfare.”

Verse 98-100. Literature position no. 37 wrongly cited.

“Wang and Dan (2014) analyzed (...) retailers [37].” - should be instead “Wang and Dan [37] analyzed (...) retailers.”

Verse 100-103. Literature position no. 38 wrongly cited.

“Li and Fan (2015) analyzed (...) strategies [38].” - should be instead “Li and Fan [38] analyzed (...) strategies.”

Verse 103-105. Literature position no. 39 wrongly cited.

“Esteves and Reggiani (2014) analyzed (..) effects [39].” - should be instead “Esteves and Reggiani [39] analyzed (..) effects.”

Verse 105. Literature position no. 40 wrongly cited.

“Colombo (2018) [40] developed” - should be instead “Colombo [40] developed”

Comment 4 -

Verse 154-164.

Symbols appearing in the text should be clarified (e.g.: θ -?, -?, U -?, τ -?).

Comment 5 -

Verse 295.

What does the term “the Congener brand” mean? It is of no occurrence anywhere else.