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#### Abstract

This comprehensive study offers an integrated investigation of various elements of rose and gerbera farming, marketing, and value-added operations. First, by evaluating the Cobb-Douglas production function's coefficients and associated statistics, the production aspect is examined. which reveals strong relationships between inputs such as labour, seedlings, fertilisers, and output yield. Second, the marketing channels used in the distribution of rose and gerbera flowers are identified, with eight separate channels ranging from direct farmer-to-consumer transactions to multi-tiered networks comprising local and Dhaka wholesalers. Third, examine average marketing expenditures for performers or agents in each channel, including expenses for baskets, packing, transportation, storage, waste loss, commission, and other costs. Finally, the net value addition for each agent across various channels is derived by subtracting the selling price from the total marketing costs. The findings shed light on the intricacies of rose and gerbera cultivation and distribution, assisting stakeholders in optimising production methods, marketing approaches, and resource allocation to boost floriculture profits and efficiency in the floriculture industry.
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## INTRODUCTION

As an increasingly globalized market, the worldwide economic importance of cut flower industry rose significantly in recent years. Due to the growing demand of cut flower along with its thriving capture of market share in global trade, both the amount of production per unit of area and their market value are now to be taken with salient gravity. The global cut flower market is expected to reach USD 45.5 billion by 2027 with a CAGR of $4.6 \%$ from 2022 to 2027. (Markets and Markets, 2023). Worldwide, cut flowers were the 344th most traded product in 2021, with $\$ 10.5$ billion in global trade, representing $0.05 \%$ of total world trade and ranking 953rd in the Product Complexity Index (OEC, 2023). In Bangladesh, over 100,000 people are employed directly or indirectly by commercial floriculture, which is practiced by $10,000-12,000$ farm
families on a production base of approximately 10,000 hectares, of which $70 \%$ is dedicated to the production of flowers with the value of exports TK 3840 million, while the local market turnover is approximately TK 4000 million (FAO, 2011). For FY2020-21, Bangladesh produced 32,120 tonnes of flowers on 3,930 hectares, up $12 \%$ from 931 hectares in FY 2009-10 (BBS, 2023). Among the major cut flowers produced extensively in the world, rose and gerbera hold significant portion of the floriculture industry (Gudin, 1999 and Rahman et al., 2013). Roses are a popular cut flower for commerce and are grown all around the world; it belongs to the Rosaceae family and genus Rosa. (Rusanov, K., et al 2009). Roses are widely grown in Asia for their cut flower industry, although fewer species are native to Europe, North America, and northwest Africa (Xia, Y et al., 2006, Debener, T., \& Linde, M. 2009 and Liorzou, M et al., 2016). As for the scenario of Bangladesh in rose production, in the years 2021-22, total production of rose was 22140.14 metric tons and the area under production was 608.09 acres and it is evident that roses predominate in domestic output; at about 22,000 tons, over two-thirds ( $67 \%$ ) were roses (BBS, 2023 and Dhaka Tribune, 2023). Whereas the gerbera is a native of tropical Asia and Africa and belongs to the Asteraceae (Compositae) family and genus Gerbera which currently includes 45 species (Pasini et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2018 and Hossain, S. A. 2018). Gerbera is a highly appealing crop of cut flowers used for commercial purposes, and it is sold in large quantities to international florists (Faust \& Dole, 2021and Reinten, E. Y et al., 2011). After tuberose, different varieties of roses, gladiolus, and marigold, gerbera is a popular flower in Bangladesh (Reza, M. 2013). Although the demand for this profitable flower is raising daily, gerbera farming in Bangladesh is currently limited to Jashore and to a lesser extent Chuadanga, Savar, Gazipur and Mymensingh (Mamun et al., 2020). The profitability of cultivating rose, and gerbera as commercial flowers differs due the difference in cost of production and their respective prices (Haque et al., 2013 and Mou, 2012). Furthermore, different factors including irrigation, fertilizer, pesticide, human labour etc., found to have different effects on the production of these two commercially viable flowers in our country (Aegerter et al., 2003). Rose and gerbera cultivation boost farmers' income and quality of life. To maximise production in this sector, yield-influencing elements and value chain dynamics must be identified, which lead to self-employment, and poverty reduction. Policy interventions can be customised. This study advances rose and gerbera culture and establishes the framework for future research. The generated data benefits flower growers, traders, and exporters. Understanding growers' socio-demographic profiles, profitability, production parameters, distribution methods, value addition, and grower and value chain actor restrictions are the goals. This study provides farm-level data on input utilisation, pricing, expenses, returns, productivity, and value chain dynamics. It advises development agencies and governments on improving rural livelihoods in Bangladesh.

## METHODOLOGY

## Study Area and Data Source

Bangladesh's Jashore and Dhaka districts were chosen as the study's area. Over a 625 -hectare area in Jashore's 35 villages, 42 domestic and foreign flower varieties are cultivated for commercial purposes. Initially, a list of gerbera and rose growers was prepared. Then, 200 flower farmers in all- 100 of whom were gerbera farmers and the other 100 of whom were rose farmers-were chosen at random to provide data. 70 flower market supply chain participants transport flowers from Jashore to Dhaka was also interviewed.

Profitability Analysis: Analysis of costs and returns is the prevailing approach utilized to ascertain profitability. In this study profitability of flower cultivation was calculated by the following method.
$\mathrm{GM}=\mathrm{TR}-\mathrm{VC}$
Where, $\mathrm{GM}=$ Gross margin, $\mathrm{TR}=$ Total revenue, $\mathrm{VC}=$ Variable cost
$\mathrm{NI}=\mathrm{TR}-\mathrm{TC}$
Where, $\mathrm{NI}=$ Net income, $\mathrm{TR}=$ Total revenue, $\mathrm{TC}=$ Total cost $\mathrm{BCR}=\mathrm{TR} / \mathrm{TC}$
Where, $\mathrm{BCR}=$ Undiscounted benefit cost ratio, $\mathrm{TR}=$ Total revenue, $\mathrm{TC}=$ Total cost $($ Variable cost + Fixed cost)

Average return per taka spent on production is a key profitability indicator.

## Analytical Technique

Cobb Douglas production function determined flower production input-output relationship and significant variables.

To solve it using OLS, the function was logarithmically modified.
$\operatorname{LnY}=a+b_{1} \ln X_{1}+b_{2} \ln X_{2}+b_{3} \ln X_{3}+b_{4} \ln X_{4}+b_{5} \ln X_{5}+U i$

Where,
$\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{Y}$ ield (Stick /ha);
$\mathrm{X}_{1}=$ Human Labor (Man-days /ha);
$\mathrm{X}_{2}=$ Seedlings (Numbe r/ha);
$\mathrm{X}_{3}=$ Fertilizers (Kg /ha);
$\mathrm{X}_{4}=$ Insecticides ( $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ );
$\mathrm{X}_{5}=$ Irrigation (Liter /ha); $\mathrm{a}=$ Intercept;
$\mathrm{b}_{1}, \mathrm{~b}_{2}, \mathrm{~b}_{3}, \mathrm{~b}_{4}, \mathrm{~b}_{5}=$ coefficients of the variables to estimate. Ui $=$ Error term.
Marketing Cost of Value Chain Actors
Marketing expenditures involve expenses for promoting flower shipment from farmers to customers. Marketing costs include transportation, loading, unloading, storage, market fees, commissions, and packaging. This data came from surveys and interviews.

## Net Value Addition

The gap between sell and buy prices adds value. The use of gross margin analysis is based on the belief that actor's priorities return over cost. The following equation will evaluate the value created by specific actors. Additionally, value addition will evaluate consumer and farmer prices.
$\mathrm{VA}=\mathrm{SP}-\mathrm{PP}$.
Where, $\mathrm{VA}=$ Value addition, $\mathrm{SP}=$ Sale price, $\mathrm{PP}=$ Purchase Price

To determine net value addition, subtract marketing expenditures from value addition.
Net value addition $=$ VA-MC.
Where, VA = Value addition, MC= Marketing cost

## RESULTS

## Per-hectare Rose and Gerbera Cultivation Cost

The cost of cultivation of rose and gerbera as per hectare under these two crops with respect to various items of expenditure was calculated and it is presented in Table 1. Analyses were conducted on the variable costs associated with rose and gerbera cultivation per hectare, including labor, land preparation, seedlings, fertilizers, and so forth. The total cost of roses amounted to Tk. 327,019 , with the most expensive component being seedlings. The principal reason for the increased total cost of Tk. 538,479 in Gerberas was seedlings. In comparison to the cultivation of roses, gerbera cultivation exhibited a higher cost per hectare.

## Profitability of Rose and Gerbera Cultivation

Table 2 shows rose and gerbera profitability. Like any business, rose and gerbera cultivation profitability depends on production and cost. Per hectare of farming, rose and gerbera returns were calculated using the value of each flower stick. Rose farming had a gross return, net return, and gross margin of Tk. 902484, Tk. 575465 , and Tk. 648214, whereas gerbera farming had Tk. 2116800, 1578321, and 1646766. For rose culture, the complete cost and cash cost benefit cost ratios were 2.76 and 3.55 , and for gerbera cultivation, 3.93 and 4.50 . Table 2 shows that rose and gerbera farming were profitable, but gerbera was more profitable.

Table 1. Per-hectare rose and gerbera cultivation cost

| Cost items | Units | Amount (Unit /ha) |  | Price (Tk. /Unit) |  | Cost (Tk. /ha) |  | Percent of cost (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rose | Gerbera | Rose | Gerbera | Rose | Gerbera | Rose | Gerbera |
| Variable cost items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percen variab | $\begin{gathered} \text { of total } \\ \operatorname{cost}(\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Human labor | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Man- } \\ & \text { days } \end{aligned}$ | 70 | 65 | 475 | 475 | 33250 | 30875 | 13.08 | 6.57 |
| Land preparation | Tk. |  |  |  |  | 2120 | 3550 | 0.83 | 0.76 |
| Seedling | No. | 6397 | 6000 | 10 | 36 | 63970 | 216000 | 25.16 | 45.95 |
| Organic manure | Kg. | 1728 | 1817 | 1 | 1 | 1728 | 1817 | 0.68 | 0.39 |
| Urea | Kg. | 1545 | 1635 | 16 | 16 | 24720 | 26160 | 9.72 | 5.56 |
| TSP | Kg. | 1100 | 1136 | 25 | 25 | 27500 | 28400 | 10.82 | 6.04 |
| MoP | Kg. | 555 | 615 | 16 | 16 | 8880 | 9840 | 3.49 | 2.09 |
| Insecticides | Brail | 384 | 356 | 125 | 125 | 48000 | 44500 | 18.88 | 9.47 |
| Irrigation | Tk. |  |  |  |  | 33153 | 43652 | 13.04 | 9.29 |
| Poly House |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45000 |  | 9.57 |
| Interest on operating cost |  |  |  |  |  | 10949 | 20240 | 4.31 | 4.31 |
| Fixed cost items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percen cost (\% | of total fixed |


| Land use cost |  |  |  |  |  | 72749 | 68445 | 100 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total cost items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percent of total cost <br> $(\%)$ |  |
| Total variable <br> cost |  |  |  |  |  | 254270 | 470034 | 77.75 | 87.29 |
| Total fixed cost |  |  |  |  |  | 72749 | 68445 | 22.25 | 12.71 |
| Total cost |  |  |  |  |  | 327019 | 538479 | 100 | 100 |

Table 2. The profitability of cultivating gerberas and roses

| Items | Total (Tk. /hectare) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Rose | Gerbera |  |  |
| Gross returns | 902484 | 2116800 |  |
| Yield(stick/ha) | Price(tk./stick) |  |  |
| Rose | 530873 | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ |  |
| Gerbera 216000 | $\mathbf{9 . 8}$ |  |  |
| Total variable costs | 254270 | 470034 |  |
| Total Fixed Cost | 72749 | 68445 |  |
| Total costs | 327019 | 538479 |  |
| Net return | 575465 | 1578321 |  |
| Gross margin | 648214 | 1646766 |  |
| Benefit-cost ratio |  |  |  |
| (Full cost basis) | 2.76 | 3.93 |  |
| Benefit-cost ratio |  |  |  |
| (Cash cost basis) | 3.55 | 4.50 |  |

## Factors Influencing Gerbera and Rose Cultivation Yields

The Cobb-Douglas production function study showed that inputs had a major effect on the growth of gerberas and roses. Table 3 shows calculated Cobb-Douglas production function co-efficient and statistics.

The study of the Cobb-Douglas production function showed that inputs had a noteworthy impact on the growth of gerberas and roses. The production of roses was positively impacted by human labor (0.226), seedlings ( 0.124 ), urea ( 0.186 ), and irrigation ( 0.035 ); MOP (0.102), pesticides (0.050), and TSP (0.115) had less pronounced but still significant effects. Organic manure had no discernible effect. The yield of gerberas was positively impacted by seedlings (1.049) and TSP ( 0.628 ), although organic manure ( 0.438 ) demonstrated significance at the $10 \%$ level. Insecticides, urea, and human labor had no discernible effects. Strong explanatory power was indicated by the coefficients of determination (R2), which were 0.97 for gerberas and 0.81 for roses. The coefficients for roses and gerberas added up to 1.04 and 1.93 , respectively, indicating that both crops showed rising returns to scale. The yield variation was shown to be strongly dependent on the included factors, as indicated by the F-values of 76.96 for roses and 475.7 for gerberas, which were significant at the $1 \%$ level.

Table 3. Estimated Cobb-Douglas Production Function Coefficients and Statistics

|  | Rose |  |  | Gerbera |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Explanatory variables | Co-efficient | Standard error | T-value | Co-efficient | Standard error | T- value |
| Intercept | 13.071*** | 3.449 | 3.79 | 4.546*** | 1.561 | 2.91 |
| Human labour ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ) | 0.226*** | 0.088 | 2.58 | -0.063NS | 0.047 | -1.35 |
| Seedling ( $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ ) | 0.124*** | 0.035 | 3.54 | 1.049*** | 0.106 | 9.93 |
| Organic manure ( $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ <br> ) | 0.203NS | 0.327 | 0.62 | 0.438* | 0.247 | 1.77 |
| Urea ( $\mathrm{X}_{4}$ ) | 0.186*** | 0.049 | 3.79 | -0.100NS | 0.203 | -0.49 |
| TSP ( $\mathrm{X}_{5}$ ) | 0.115* | 0.072 | 1.60 | 0.628*** | 0.231 | 2.72 |
| MOP ( $\mathrm{X}_{6}$ ) | 0.102** | 0.048 | 2.14 | 0.051 NS | 0.121 | 0.42 |
| Insecticides ( $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ ) | 0.050** | 0.025 | 1.98 | -0.272NS | 0.137 | -1.50 |
| Irrigation ( $\mathrm{X}_{8}$ ) | 0.035*** | 0.010 | 3.39 | 0.201NS | 0.197 | 1.02 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 0.81 |  |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Adjusted R ${ }^{2}$ | 0.80 |  |  |  | 0.96 |  |
| Return to scale | 1.04 |  |  |  | 1.93 |  |
| F-value | 76.96*** |  |  |  | 475.7*** |  |

Note: *** Significant at 1\%; ** Significant at 5\% ; * Significant at 10\%; and NS: Not Significant.

## Value Chain Mapping and Actor Distribution in Rose and Gerbera Marketing

The value chain for cut flowers (Rose and Gerbera) includes input suppliers, farmers, wholesalers, forias, contact farming agents, Dhaka wholesale market, retailers, and consumers (Figure 1). This value chain chart clarifies links and integration.

The following major channels were involved in rose and gerbera marketing:
Channel i: Farmer $\rightarrow$ local consumer
Channel ii: Farmer $\rightarrow$ local retailer $\rightarrow$ local consumer
Channel iii: Farmer $\rightarrow$ local wholesaler $\rightarrow$ local retailer $\rightarrow$ local consumer
Channel iv: Farmer $\rightarrow$ local wholesaler $\rightarrow$ Dhaka wholesaler $\rightarrow$ retailer $\rightarrow$ consumer
Channel v: Farmer $\rightarrow$ contact farming agent $\rightarrow$ Dhaka wholesaler (Shahbag and Agargoan) $\rightarrow$ retailer $\rightarrow$ consumer

Channel vi: Farmer $\rightarrow$ foria $\rightarrow$ contact farming agent $\rightarrow$ Dhaka wholesaler (Shahbag and Agargoan) $\rightarrow$ retailer $\rightarrow$ consumer

Channel vii: Farmer $\rightarrow$ foria $\rightarrow$ local wholesaler $\rightarrow$ Dhaka wholesaler (Shahbag and Agargoan) $\rightarrow$ retailer $\rightarrow$ consumer

Channel viii: Farmer $\rightarrow$ foria $\rightarrow$ Contact farming agent $\rightarrow$ local wholesaler $\rightarrow$ Dhaka wholesaler (Shahbag and Agargoan) $\rightarrow$ retailer $\rightarrow$ consumer

Channel ix: Farmer $\rightarrow$ Dhaka wholesaler (Shahbag and Agargoan) $\rightarrow$ retailer $\rightarrow$ consumer

## Marketing Cost of Rose and Gerbera

The average marketing expenses accrued by participants in the rose and gerbera value chains are detailed in Table 5. Dhaka wholesalers and retailers incurred the greatest prices for roses, at Tk 68.2 and Tk 59.7 , respectively. 29 taka were expended by farmers on marketing expenses. Gerberas were once more most expensive for wholesalers and retailers in Dhaka, at Tk 73.2 and Tk 70.7, respectively. 37.2 Tk was expended by farmers on marketing expenses.

## Net Value Addition of Rose and Gerbera

The net value addition (Tk. 159.4/100 rose) for roses sold to local consumers (Channel i) was the highest, while the lowest (Tk. 39.4/100 rose) was obtained when roses were sold to contact agricultural agents (Channel v) and to forias in Channel vii. The gerberas that were sold directly to local consumers resulted in the greatest net value addition (Tk 470.5/100 gerbera), whereas the gerberas that were sold to contact agricultural agents (Channel v and forias in Channel vii) generated the least (Tk 113.5/100 gerbera). When selling to end consumers (Channel ix), retailers achieved the greatest net value addition for both roses (Tk. 120.3/100 rose) and gerberas (Tk. 949.3/100 gerbera).


Figure 1. Cut flower (Rose and Gerbera) value chain map and actor dispersion.

Table 5. The average cost of marketing roses and gerberas for various actors (Tk./100 Sticks)

| Cost Items o <br> Marketing | Actors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Farmer | Foria | Contact <br> Farming Agent | Local <br> Wholesaler | Local <br> Retailer | Dhaka <br> Wholesaler | Retailer |
| Rose |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Basket | 8 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| Packing | 2 |  |  |  | 5 | 4.8 | 8.5 |
| Transport |  | 5 |  |  | 6 | 12.5 | 8 |
| Telephone cost |  | 10 | 10 |  |  | 2.7 |  |
| Storage | 4 |  |  |  |  | 4.8 |  |
| Wastage loss | 15 |  |  | 7 | 2.5 | 5 | 3.2 |
| Commission |  |  | 3.5 |  | 4.4 | 10 | 4.5 |
| Shop rent |  |  |  | 5 | 10 | 23.4 | 30.5 |
| Other cost |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total cost | 29 | 25 | 20.5 | 19 | 34.9 | 68.2 | 59.7 |
| Gerbera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Basket | 8 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 5 |
| Packing | 5 |  |  |  | 8 | 4.8 | 8.5 |
| Transport |  | 5 | 10 |  | 6 | 12.5 | 8 |
| Telephone cost |  | 10 | 10 |  |  | 2.9 | 6 |
| Storage | 5.5 | 6 | 5 | 5.6 |  | 4.8 | 5 |
| Wastage loss | 16.7 |  |  | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.8 | 3.2 |
| Commission |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 5.4 | 10 | 4.5 |
| Shop rent |  |  |  | 8 | 10 | 23.4 | 30.5 |
| Other cost | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Total cost | 37.2 | 30.5 | 36.5 | 27.1 | 40.9 | 73.2 | 70.7 |

Table 6. Net value addition of roses in several channels

| Agents |  | Rose Marketing Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | i | ii | iii | iv | v | vi | vii | viii | ix |
|  | Purchase price | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 | 61.60 |
|  | Selling price | 250 | 150 | 145 | 145 | 130 | 160 | 130 | 160 | 200 |
| Farmer | Value Addition | 188.4 | 88.4 | 83.4 | 83.4 | 68.4 | 98.4 | 68.4 | 98.4 | 138.4 |
|  | Marketing cost | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 |
|  | Net Value Addition | 159.4 | 59.4 | 54.4 | 54.4 | 39.4 | 69.4 | 39.4 | 69.4 | 109.4 |
|  | Purchase price |  |  |  |  |  | 160 | 130 | 160 |  |
| For | Selling price |  |  |  |  |  | 250 | 170 | 250 |  |
| Fo | Value Addition |  |  |  |  |  | 90 | 40 | 90 |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 |  |


|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  |  | 65 | 15 | 65 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact Farming Agent | Purchase price |  |  |  |  | 130 | 250 | 170 | 250 |  |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  |  | 200 | 300 | 240 | 300 |  |
|  | Value Addition |  |  |  |  | 70 | 50 | 70 | 50 |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  |  | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 |  |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  |  | 49.5 | 29.5 | 49.5 | 29.5 |  |
| Local Wholesaler | Purchase price |  |  | 145 | 145 |  |  | 240 |  |  |
|  | Selling price |  |  | 250 | 300 |  |  | 300 |  |  |
|  | Value Addition |  |  | 105 | 155 |  |  | 60 |  |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  | 19 | 19 |  |  | 19 |  |  |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  | 86 | 136 |  |  | 41 |  |  |
| Local Retailer | Purchase price |  | 150 | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Selling price |  | 225 | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Value Addition |  | 75 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  | 34.9 | 34.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Net Value Addition |  | 40.1 | 15.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dhaka Wholesaler | Purchase price |  |  |  | 300 | 200 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 200 |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  | 400 | 300 | 400 | 380 | 400 | 320 |
|  | Value Addition |  |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 120 |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  | 67.2 | 67.2 | 67.2 | 67.2 | 67.2 | 67.2 |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  | 32.8 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 12.8 | 32.8 | 52.8 |
| Retailer | Purchase price |  |  |  | 400 | 300 | 400 | 380 | 400 | 320 |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  | 470 | 450 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 450 |
|  | Value Addition |  |  |  | 70 | 150 | 100 | 180 | 100 | 130 |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  | 59.7 | 59.7 | 59.7 | 59.7 | 59.7 | 59.7 |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  | 10.3 | 90.3 | 40.3 | 120.3 | 40.3 | 50.3 |
|  | Total Net Value Addition | 159.4 | 99.5 | 155.6 | 233.5 | 212 | 237 | 263 | 237 | 232.5 |

Table 7. Net value addition of gerbera in several channels

| Agents |  | Gerbera Marketing Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | i | ii | iii | iv | v | vi | vii | viii | ix |
|  | Purchase price | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 | 249.3 |
|  | Selling price | 750 | 500 | 450 | 450 | 400 | 460 | 400 | 460 | 700 |
|  | Value Addition | 450.7 | 249.7 | 200.7 | 200.7 | 150.7 | 210.7 | 150.7 | 210.7 | 500.7 |
| Farmer | Marketing cost | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 37.2 |
|  | Net Value Addition | 470.5 | 213.5 | 163.5 | 163.5 | 113.5 | 173.5 | 113.5 | 173.5 | 413.5 |
| Foria | Purchase price |  |  |  |  |  | 460 | 400 | 460 |  |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  |  |  | 580 | 510 | 570 |  |
|  | Value Addition |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 110 | 130 |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  |  |  | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.5 |  |


|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  |  |  | 89.5 | 79.5 | 99.5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contact <br> Farming Agent | Purchase price |  |  |  |  | 400 | 580 | 510 | 570 |  |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  |  | 600 | 700 | 640 | 700 |  |
|  | Value Addition |  |  |  |  | 200 | 120 | 150 | 130 |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  |  | 36.5 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 36.5 |  |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  |  | 163.5 | 83.5 | 113.5 | 93.5 |  |
| Local Wholesaler | Purchase price |  |  | 450 | 450 |  |  | 640 |  |  |
|  | Selling price |  |  | 650 | 700 |  |  | 800 |  |  |
|  | Value Addition |  |  | 200 | 250 |  |  | 160 |  |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  | 27.1 | 27.1 |  |  | 27.1 |  |  |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  | 172.9 | 222.9 |  |  | 132.9 |  |  |
| Local Retailer | Purchase price |  | 500 | 650 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Selling price |  | 700 | 800 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Value Addition |  | 200 | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Marketing cost |  | 40.9 | 40.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Net Value Addition |  | 159.1 | 109.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dhaka Wholesaler | Purchase price |  |  |  | 700 | 600 | 700 | 800 | 700 | 700 |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  | 900 | 900 | 925 | 980 | 850 | 950 |
|  | Value Addition |  |  |  | 200 | 300 | 225 | 180 | 150 | 250 |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  | 73.2 | 73.2 | 73.2 | 73.2 | 73.2 | 73.2 |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  | 126.8 | 226.8 | 151.8 | 106.8 | 76.8 | 176.8 |
| Retailer | Purchase price |  |  |  | 900 | 900 | 925 | 980 | 850 | 950 |
|  | Selling price |  |  |  | 1200 | 1500 | 1300 | 2000 | 1700 | 1550 |
|  | Value |  |  |  | 300 | 600 | 375 | 1020 | 850 | 600 |
|  | Marketing cost |  |  |  | 70.7 | 70.7 | 70.7 | 70.7 | 70.7 | 70.7 |
|  | Net Value Addition |  |  |  | 229.3 | 529.3 | 304.3 | 949.3 | 779.3 | 529.3 |
|  | Total Net Value Addition | 470.5 | 372.6 | 445.5 | 742.5 | 1033.1 | 802.2 | 1517 | 1222.6 | 1119.6 |

## DISCUSSION

The Cobb-Douglas model showed that human labour, seedlings, and other inputs affected rose and gerbera yields. Profitability and value chain analysis revealed Bangladesh's detailed rose and gerbera agriculture profitability dynamics.

Benefit-cost ratios (BCRs) for rose and gerbera cultivation were shown to be favorable in previous research conducted in the districts of Jashore and Mymensingh (Haque et al., 2013 and Mou, 2012). Our analysis, which displays BCRs of $3.93 / 4.50$ for gerberas and $2.76 / 3.55$ for roses on full/cash-cost bases, is consistent
with these conclusions. Growing gerberas was consistently more profitable, which was consistent with patterns found in earlier studies (Aegerter et al., 2003 and Hajong et al., 2022).

This study showed various inputs that significantly affect rose and gerbera yield. Skill-oriented labour management and organisation choice are associated to cut rose cultivation (van 't Ooster et al., 2015). A prior study indicated that seedling density and plant material significantly affected rose yield (Pessala, T. A. P. A. N. I. 1977). Inorganic fertilisers like urea, TSP, and MOP have been studied on rose types in several countries (García-Castro \& Restrepo-Díaz, 2013; Al-Sayed et al., 2019; Kumar et al., 2017; Hamedi et al., 2022). One study found that pesticides increase rose yield in Ecuador (Idrovo-Novillo et al., 2019). In diverse climates, irrigation frequencies and procedures affected rose production quantity and quality (Kittas et al., 2004; Katsoulas et al., 2006; Fascella, 2010). Our study also indicated that rose output was positively and significantly associated with human work, seedling, urea, TSP, MOP, pesticides, and irrigation. This study also reveals that seedling, organic manure, and TSP affect gerbera yield. Exotic potted gerbera varieties were studied in Bangladesh for growth and yield (Uddin et al., 2012). Rashid, M. H. (2020) investigated how TSP in final land preparation affects gerbera production potential in Bangladesh. A prior study examined gerbera flower output after organic manure treatment (Longchar, A., \& Keditsu, R. 2013).

This study's value chain analysis shows nine rose and gerbera marketing channels with various actors and marketing cost structures, comparable with other Bangladeshi research. A prior study examined Bangladesh's flower industry value chain and rose and gerbera market share (Rakibuzzaman, M et al., 2018). In this study, we examined rose and gerbera net value addition. Qualitative interviews with Bangladeshi farmers could add depth to these findings and inspire more research.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, using Cobb-Douglas modelling in conjunction with profitability and value chain analysis, our research offers a thorough insight of the intricate dynamics of gerbera and rose production in Bangladesh. We determined that important variables affecting yields included labour, fertilisers, irrigation, and seedlings. Higher benefit-cost ratios indicate that gerbera growing is generally more profitable than rose cultivation. The floriculture industry's complex distribution network emphasises how crucial it is to make well-informed decisions and implement calculated interventions in order to maximise production and marketing techniques. Notwithstanding certain limitations, such as the study's concentration on just two districts and the exclusion of certain elements like inflation, the results are consistent with other national studies. Notably, by utilising nationally representative data, the study presents a novel viewpoint on the cultivation of roses and gerberas in Bangladesh. Policymakers and other stakeholders can use this insightful data to create efficient intervention plans that will benefit farmers and consumers alike.
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