

Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

General

Point 1: My general issue with this manuscript is with English and grammar. The authors have frequently used very long and confusing sentences, which makes it difficult to understand the study. Also, the use of punctuation should be improved.

Response 1: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. we have edited the language throughout the manuscript.

Title:

Point 2: The study was at the sub-basin, not the entire basin, so the title should change accordingly.

Response 2: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Abstract

Point 3: Line 16-17: the sentence is not completed or has the fragment

Response 3: Thank you for your comment. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Point 4: Line 24 The abbreviation must be defined at its first appearance (please do the same for all abbreviations used in the manuscript).

Response 4: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Point 5: Can you rewrite the abstract (current versions seem like an introduction instead of an abstract)? In the abstract, the authors should keep the flow of the idea. It's also a good idea to highlight the most noteworthy findings and novelties. Hence, the abstract is not clear, and shall be rewritten.

Response 5: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Introduction

Point 6: Line 31: the word ‘troubled’ shall be replaced with another word.

Response 6: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Point 7: At the end of the introduction section in addition to the objectives, describing the method used is recommended, hence missed.

Response 7: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have incorporated see in the manuscript.

Materials and Methods

Point 8: A sample questionnaire shall be included in the supplementary material.

Response 8: Thank you for your suggestion. If it is necessary we have included in the supplementary material.

Point 9: Fig. 1 the figure quality should be improved

Response 9: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Point 10: Fig. 2 the conceptual framework is not clear, which comes first and then what? Can you provide a high impactful schematic diagram to understand the proposed research framework where the big impact of the results can be presented?

Response 10: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript. I think it is clear, the arrow shows the direction and which one is first and next. The diagram demonstrated that SWC technology adoption stage and the influences of determinants on the household decision about soil and water conservation measures.

Result and Discussion

point 11: Line 260 ... the farmer filled to maintain..... check the word ‘filled’

Response 11: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

point 12: Line 268-269: the family size shall be round to integer, and you should do the same in all bodies of the manuscript

Response 12: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have edited see in the manuscript.

Point 13: The discussion needs further elaboration. The author should discuss the outcomes of the previous study in this region.

Response 13: Thank you for your comment and suggestion. We have discussed supported with empirical studies conducted in the study basin and throughout the country