



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMCS_14892
Title of the Manuscript:	Maize Price Stabilization in Ghana: An Application of Continuous-Time Delay Differential Model with Buffer Stock
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I gave 6 major comments and 3 minor comments in the last report. I do not think that the authors correctly respond to these comments. To comment (1), what the authors mention is that they could have only limited data. If so, it is not a good idea to estimate behavioural functions with unsatisfactory data. To comment (2), I did not understand what the authors did. I could not find any differences between Figure 1 of this version and Figure 1 of the original version. To comment (3), the authors did not respond at all. To comment (4), the authors did not explain why the length of delay was assumed to be unity. To comment (5), I did not understand the authors' response. In the revised version, the authors still mentioned "the solution of equation (7) oscillates between two (2) equilibrium (price) points...." just below Figure 2. However it seems to me that the trajectory oscillates around the zero solution. To comment (6), I did not agree with the comments by the authors. I just recommend the authors to derive the stability conditions for the delay equation. To minor comment (1), the authors just said that they could have only limited data, however, I am asking the assumption's rationality. To minor comment (2), the authors said "Considered." However I did not see what the authors considered. To minor comment (3), I did not think the introduction was shortened.	Comment (1)-it is assumed that supply is dependent on only price as given by the model. We do not have any other information to enable us estimate about any shocks. That is why we assume that there are no exogenous shocks to trigger fluctuations. The fact that we are limited to only this data doesn't make the data unsatisfactory. We didn't want to take any chances. Comment (2)- I don't understand what you referred to the original. However, if it's about the first publication, then there shouldn't be any difference because it is the same data with different objectives in both publications. Neither is the review of the other. Comment (3)-R^2 is 0.67 which shows that the model best fit the data Comment (4&5)-delay as unity makes the model behaves as discrete time case (like the first publication which compare linear and nonlinear cobweb model) which gives two equilibriums price points 0 and 161.5 of which 0 was stable (but unrealistic) and 161.5 unstable (realistic in Ghanaian market situation). By numerical approach, the price would oscillate between these two points (as published in the second issue in October 2014). Comment (6)-when linearize the model we risk losing certain properties of nonlinearity. Secondly one has to map one solution onto other solutions so many times before solution is reached using the analytical approach. With numerical approach, it is simple. By varying the time stability is achieved with ease. Minor Comment (1)-I used this assumption in order not to take chances. Because I don't any information about any shocks. Minor Comment (2)- Most buffer schemes operate using these assumptions in order to stabilize price. However, I welcome any new ideas if you can help. Minor Comment (3)- Now considered