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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript makes an important contribution to the literature on rural economic development and gender empowerment by providing robust empirical evidence on the economic impact of women-led dairy cooperatives. Using primary data and rigorous econometric methods (propensity score matching with multiple algorithms), it highlights how cooperative membership enhances milk yield, reduces production costs, and improves net returns for women dairy farmers. The focus on the Mulkanoor Women Dairy Cooperative offers valuable policy lessons for scaling similar models in developing countries, especially in gender-inclusive agricultural value chains. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title is clear and descriptive. However, for greater precision, suggest:  "Economic Impact of Cooperative Membership on Women Dairy Farmers: Evidence from the Mulkanoor Women Dairy Cooperative, Telangana". | Accepted the suggested change in title and modified in manuscript |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is generally comprehensive, presenting the objectives, methodology, key results, and conclusions. However, it could be improved by:  - Explicitly stating the sample size and the time frame of data collection.  - Briefly mentioning the statistical significance of the main findings.  - Clarifying the role of bonus payments in offsetting the lower base milk price. | -Explicitly mentioned sample size, time frame is already mentioned. -Mentioned the statistical significance of the results under results part in abstract.  -mentioned the value of bonus received. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound. The study design, sampling method, and econometric approach are appropriate for the research objectives. The application of multiple PSM algorithms and thorough balance diagnostics strengthens the reliability of the results. The interpretation of findings is consistent with the data presented. Minor improvements could be made by elaborating more on potential limitations (e.g., unobserved variables that may affect membership and outcomes) and discussing external validity. | -Limitations and scope are discussed separately under the heading 3.4 Limitations and scope -External validity of the study is discussed by adding a sentence in the conclusion part. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are adequate, relevant, and include recent studies (2023). Nevertheless, the literature review could benefit from integrating more global perspectives on women-led cooperatives, for example:   1. Hellin, J., Lundy, M., & Meijer, M. (2009). Farmer organization, collective action and market access in Meso-America. Food Policy, 34(1), 16–22. 2. Meinzen-Dick, R., Quisumbing, A., Behrman, J., Biermayr-Jenzano, P., Wilde, V., Noordeloos, M., ... & Beintema, N. (2011). Engendering agricultural research, development and extension. IFPRI Research Monograph. | -Suggested references are included in the 4th paragraph of introduction |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript is generally well-written and the English is suitable for scholarly communication. Some minor grammatical inconsistencies and occasional overly long sentences could be revised for clarity. | Such sentences are modified. |
| Optional/General comments | The study addresses a significant gap in evaluating the economic impacts of women-led dairy cooperatives using rigorous quantitative methods. The clear presentation of descriptive statistics, regression results, and PSM outcomes is commendable. Adding a short discussion on sustainability and environmental aspects of cooperative dairy farming could further enrich the manuscript. | We appreciate the reviewer’s valuable suggestion to incorporate sustainability and environmental aspects related to cooperative dairy farming. However, to maintain a clear focus and depth in the current study, which specifically addresses the economic impacts of women-led dairy cooperatives, we have chosen to limit this manuscript to economic outcomes only. The environmental and sustainability dimensions constitute a substantial body of work that we plan to address comprehensively in a forthcoming article. This approach allows each manuscript to maintain thematic clarity and rigor without premature or fragmented treatment of related topics. |
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