



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>The abstract is comprehensive. I made some comments, however, regarding the tools (conjoint Analysis) implemented in the analysis as well as an extensive addition of discussion sentences on the result (please refers to the manuscript, marked in red yellow colour))</p> <p>The subsection structure generally appropriate. However:</p> <p>The back ground of the study regarding specific reasons for the study to be done, seem to be obtained from the results of the study itself, or preliminary observations, or other previous studies, in which case, reference is needed.</p> <p>The objectives of the study were not clearly stated.</p> <p>Some of the terms needed to be defined in practical terms (utility scores, relative importance, part- worth, traders-cum-dal millers, traders/dal millers etc.)</p> <p>The use of other tools such as Pearson and Kendal's correlations is not indicated and described in the methodology.</p> <p>-Some questions are posted within the text regarding the relative importance of the characters in the study.</p> <p>The Table and the graph seem to occupy much space</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct despite some small suggested revisions.</p> <p>Would be much better if more references are added. However, I do not have any suggestions this time.</p> <p>Since this is a practical, field experiment, the description/explanation (the language), in my opinion need to be more of practical and less conceptual or sophisticated/political, especially at the sub-title of practical/specific back grounds, Methodology, Results, Conclusion.</p>	<p>Respected Sir/Madam, I want to bring to your kind notice that many of yours that is editorial comments are overlapping with the reviewers comment, which I was previously attended and also corrected as per the reviewers comment in and edited format. As you were received my first copy other than the edited copy the comments were repeated by you. However I am attending your suggestions in the edited format.</p> <p>As per your suggestions I have added the objective statement in introduction part and also small information about conjoint analysis in abstract. Also added reference in methodology.</p> <p>The terms like utility scores and relative importance as the name indicates they represent the importance of that trait preferred by the traders and farmers.</p> <p>Pearson and Kendal's correlations were the part of the results from conjoint analysis. The represent the extent of relation between those factors. Similar to the correlation.</p> <p>For the effective representation of the results both the tables and graphs used.</p> <p>Pigeonpea is cultivated In the Kharif season only as a main crop, not in other seasons.</p> <p>(is there any rational/agronomical justifications of the farmers preference on growing crops vulnerable to pod borer than to wilt?) YES, As follows Economic rationale: Farmers can detect and respond to pod borer infestations more readily than wilt diseases, potentially reducing yield losses and preserving economic returns. Management options: Pod borer control measures may be perceived as more accessible and effective compared to wilt disease management, leading farmers to prioritize varieties resistant to pests over diseases. Market demand: Farmers may choose varieties resistant to pod borer to meet market preferences and obtain better prices for their produce. Experience and knowledge: Past losses due to pod borer infestations and access to information on pest management may influence farmers' decisions. Crop rotation and diversity: Variety selection may align with crop rotation schedules and diversification strategies aimed at reducing pest pressure over time.</p> <p>I have attended almost all the corrections by Editor and Reviewer, I would like to express my greatest thanks to you for your valuable suggestion towards my manuscript and for its betterment.</p> <p>Thank you so much.....</p>