We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable comments and for considering the potential and contribution of this study. Our response to the comments are below:

1. The paper is based on perceptions but there is no attempt to link it with observed conduct. Doing so might have important implications as it might imply that policies should work on these perceptions or on the behavior of these actors (As a farmer only interacts with a number of small traders, it might be hard for him to assess the whole universe and his perceptions might be wrong (or right)). Some of these factors are hard to measure, such as reputation. However, location and prices might be more straightforward. If possibilities exist, it might be good to test out to what extent these perceptions link with reality. With the dataset available, one could possibly do interesting additional assessments linking these observables with perceptions.

   We added Table 4 (page _) to address the linkage of perceptions with observed conduct. We look at the correlations between average ratings received by the actors and the observable characteristics of the actors. We do find association between the perceptions of the farmers (ratings) and the observed location and quality. However, no significant association between the price-based rating and the actual prices could be observed. An explanation of the results in Table 4 are provided in the last paragraph of the section 4.3 "Reliability of ratings" (page _):
   "........ Paragraph here .... "

2. I am a bit unclear about the role of traders and processors in the value chain and the extent to which farmers are able to rate them. It is said that traders buy produce and link with processors. If that is the overall structure of the value chain and farmers are asked to rate processors, what problems does this create as they might not know this person. It would be good to analyze how pervasive this problem is in this dataset. Additionally, it might possibly be interesting to analyze what farmers might say about somebody that might not really know well and compare to people that do. If data are there, it might also be good to bring intensity of interactions in there.

   We have added "..............." in section 2 "The structure of the maize supply chain" (Page _).

   We did not include the intensity of interactions between the farmers and the actors because farmers would be rating the actors with whom they have been interacting always higher which is why the farmers continue to interact with these specific actors. We also did not find any correlation between the likelihood of interaction between the farmer and the actor and the gender of the actor. This means that the likelihood of interaction is not correlated with the explanatory variable and thus, should not change the results obtained in this study.

3. There is some literature that indicates that ordering of questions and anchoring bias might be an issue, i.e. if you have said "excellent" already twice, you might want to change the next answer. Some discussion or thoughts on this potential issue might also be useful.

   We have added "..............." as footnote 3 on page _.