REVIEW COMMENTS

Comment	Response	Action
I don't think the title does the paper justice. It is fairly bland and doesn't highlight the novel insights, or the focus on the decision making. As you noted in your response to Reviewer 2 'The main theme that has been raised (and not raised in other studies) is the link between recent first generation migrant farmers and settler farmers. In this, it provides a unique insight to provide the basis to explore these factors further in future studies.' Maybe this could be emphasized in the title?	Agreed. Have updated the title to more accurately reflect the paper's findings.	Title changed.
p.1 The opening sentence of the Introduction is confounding as I'm not sure how the pun relates to the whole ag community. I would delete the first sentence.	A fair enough point. The term "grass ceiling" is one that Margaret Alston discusses when talking about agricultural careers for women. We felt that it is quite an apt way of describing the gender issues pervading the sector - as such, we've decided to leave as is. Happy for editorial decision to remove if required.	No change.
p.2 The para on hegemonic masculinity could be tighter. Line 56 - the cause and effect of the arguments not clear, so I would delete the 'As such..		Deleted word
Line 68 - the wording around 'limited benefit for women' had me scratching my head - why should women benefit? did you mean communities or for women's representation? Clarify this.	The full argument can be found within my cited paper in that line. The main argument highlights that a lack of gender diverse representation leads to solutions that are predominantly masculine-focussed. This includes the way that women are continually sidelined in discussions on water issues, and the overreliance on technocratic solutions against those that are more in line with nature. It has for so long been about dominanting natural spaces that I pose questions about how feminised responses of care should be given greater airtime in water management.	Added in line to let reader know that they should refer to the cited article for the full argument related to the statement.
p.3 line 97 - not sure poignant is the right word		Replaced with relevant
p.3 line 102 - If the focus is on the decision making and/or voice, then it seems to me this should be in the title. The current wording is 'the study examines the decision-making power farmers who identify as women feel they and others have on their farms...', yet only four of the interviewees are women. This is where more detail re the MRIC working group could help to substantiate the claim too. (It strikes me that the wording on p.3 doesn't quite match how the study is described on p.11 lines 550, which I believe does the study more justice. I would align the wording between these two sections more closely).	There may have been a misunderstanding of the study methodology, as the MRIC working group were not the ones interviewed, it was women who had a link to agriculture and farming and who live in the region. MRIC provided feedback on the researcher interpretations - as they are are locals so can understand context in a better light. No changes were made following the working group meeting, as they all unanimously agreed with the interpretations put forward of the study responses. However, your comment does raise a great point, in that the methodology may not be very clear. As such, we have rewritten and added sections to the methodology for added clarity.	Added in sections to increase clarity within the methodology.
p.5 line 221 Young and Casey (2019) cited but not included in reference list		Added to reference list
p.5 line 228 - Appendix 2 referred to before Appendix 1, and neither are included for this review so I can't see the questions or coding (as per my feedback in round 1) I am assuming this is an omission.		Changed in the paper, Appendix 1 and 2 have been uploaded this time.
p.5 line 235 - the description of the approach appears to me to be inductive not deductive.		great catch - we changed the language from deductive to inductive (p6, line 152)
p.7 line 303 - I think compared should be included between...roles and to irrigated farmers...	We could not find an instance of this in the paper - we conducted a search function for these words, and also read through all of page 7, but could not find the location related to this comment.	No change.
p.7 - with respect to this theme, my opening comment about being clearer/more critical about whose voices are being heard would be helpful here.	Good point. At the start of this section (4.2), we have clearly stated that the interviews were all of settler women, reminding the reader that the perspective of the findings only presents one viewpoint.	Added in "(noting that the interviews all involved settler women) " in Line 200.
p.8 line 409 - I am not sure what was meant by the migrant dynamic unravelling in the area (clarifying this may help to address my comment from p.7)	Added a sentence after this line to clarify what is meant by 'the migrant dynamic'.	Added "The migrant dynamic refers to the recent influx of recent migrants settling in the area and entering farming practice."
p.9 line 457 - 'together with the superiority complex associated with feminist identities' - this seems to come out of the blue, and I am not sure what is meant by it?	Good point.	Changed sentence to "The intertwining of racialized imaginaries of white farming practice continue to uphold colonial practice. "
p.10 lines 525-527 - it seems to me the difference re 'community bonds' could be a matter of timing eg recency of migration rather than an enduring difference or something unique to 'settler women'.	Add this to discussion section.	Added "Although not mentioned by participants, the perception that irrigated agriculture and by extension migrant farmers have less of a community bond could be impacted by timing. Settler communities have generational connections to their and other families in the region that more recently established migrant families do not have access to. " This is an important point to bring up, but since it was not something participants brought up themselves, it does not change our ideas about perceptions of othering
p.10 line 539 omit "as a result' as what follows does not logically flow from the preceding para.	Good pick up	Removed 'as a result'.
p.11 I think the wording in the Conclusion lines 567-572 should be reflected in the title.	Couldn't find what these lines refer to	No change.