Round 3 Reviewer Comments	Column1	Column2	Column3
Page/Section	Comment	Response	Action
	I think the reviewer comment "p.7 line 303 - I think compared should be included between...roles and to irrigated farmers..." referred to the following sentence (L213-214) in your latest manuscript version with tracked changes : "Perceived representation of women within farming was tied to beliefs about underlying power dynamics within different types of farming, particularly differences in dryland farming family roles to irrigated agriculture". Please adjust as per the reviewer comment.	Ah thank you for finding this for us! Have amended.	Added 'compared' as per reviewer request
	My guess is that the reviewer comment "p.11 I think the wording in the Conclusion lines 567-572 should be reflected in the title" is referring to your previous manuscript version with tracked changes, uploaded on 14 Nov 2024. The following sentences from your conclusions: "The most alarming finding within this exploratory study was the distinction made in the interviews between recent migrant farmers (irrigated agriculture) and those that have been farming for many generations in dryland is quite stark" to "Their analysis of publications in the last 20 years had highlighted a burgeoning interest in white women's experiences, with little mention or emphasis on racial inequality and class difference inherent in such environments".	Thank you for also finding the lines this refers to! We have changed the title to more accurately reflect the content of the article, however we didn't want to lean too heavily on putting the migration aspect front-and-centre, as we recognise that there are limitations to the study and don't want to ovepromise in the title! As such, we've changed it to be more subtle... hopefully that's okay with the editorial team !	
	1. As this manuscript is speaking to gender and not sex, please use the gender terms man/men('s) and woman/women('s) or nonbinary throughout and not the biological sex terms of male and female.	Great point. All amended throughout document.	Found one instance of this in line 238. Have changed to 'men and 'women'.
	2. Line 458 - These is unclear with revisions, but also not sure that you have articulated desired gender norms per the previous text. Are the desired gender norms also the traditional norms seen in dryland? Current text across sections suggests that there might be a tension between these, or a shift where traditional norms are a sense of pride in some cases (child and community caring) and unacceptable in others (joint decision making and voice at decision making tables)? While this emerges in the conclusion, it is not a fully articulated in the results, particularly section 2/3.	I have done quite a bit of thinking on this one, and I think you are right. There is a notion of an 'ideal' gender norm, but this is not clearly expressed in the article. I have revisited the transcripts as well as the literature to pin down what my interpretation of the desired gender norms of dryland participants were.	Added in lines 265-276.
	Conclusion - typically there are no references in the conclusion as a summary of what has already been presented. These should be woven into the results if they are not already there.	I have only kept the references related to those that I explicitly mention in the text, and removed all other references. Hopefully this helps make it more conclusion-like!	Removed citations (all have been included elsewhere in the manuscript anyway). Only kept those that I explicitly refer to in the body of the conclusion.
	Line 41 - there has rather than there's		Changed
	Line 101 - this study explores rather than examines?		Changed
	Line 103 - However as the start of a new sentence to enhance clarity for the reader		Changed
	Figure 1 - should have an inset of the whole of Australia (or set as Fig 1a and b) as well as a N arrow and scale bar for the main map	I have inserted a map of Australia, indicating where Victoria is located and that the map is inset. Including a scale bar is outside of my expertise, though!	Inserted map of Australia, updated caption to reflect change
	Line 152 - had or has?		Changed
	Line 209/10 - please reword for clarity		Separated out int oindividual sentences for clarity.
	Line 269 - Study participants should be numbered so that readers can see the diversity of individuals drawn upon in the analysis		Completed.
	Line 409 - unravelling seems to be the wrong word in this context		Replaced with emerging
	Line 411/12 - it is unclear what the traditional gender norms are here - is it joint decision-making?		
	Line 459 - which resulted in		changed
	Line 461 - formed or informed?		Changed to 'informed'
	Line 539/41 - does not follow from the previous paragraph. Consider moving to after the quote (Line 466)		Previous revision had removed this line, so no longer relevant.
	Line 566 - was that the distinction....		Have changed to : "The most alarming finding within this exploratory study was the otherness expressed in the interviews towards recent migrant farmers (within irrigated agriculture) from those that have been farming for many generations in dryland. "
	Line 576 - not sure that it is as such, rather that this study does come with a number of caveats		Removed 'as such'
	Please check your references - you have at least one listed under first name of author		