Reply on CC3
Caitlyn A. Hall et al.

Thank you for taking the time to read this manuscript, and for providing helpful and specific feedback for how to improve this work. Below we have responded to all your comments and indicated how we will change the manuscript (which for ease of use we have written in blue text) as a result of these suggestions.

CC3.1: The expectation that English is the language of academic writing has the potential to both ignore or simplify the range of knowledge held by those who do not or cannot speak or write in English and can also undermine the depth of knowledge contained within a local language. Allowing greater use of names and concepts held by local language speakers brings critical information into the academic sphere without recourse to sometimes unwieldy translations.

For example: studies by my organisation worked with indigenous peoples to understand the symbiotic ecological relationship between two fish species. *Kallunthi* when literally translated means 'stone turner' in the tongue of the Kuruma people of northern Kerala. However, contained within that name is an understanding that the fish is turning stones to clean them for later spawning by the hump-backed mahseer. *Kallunthi* does not simply mean 'stone turner', it also means 'fish that turns and cleans stones for our God fish to use for breeding during a different season'.

By allowing greater use of local or regional languages and making the effort to understand the broader concepts a simple translation may ignore, we help to enrich the whole process of academic writing.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their discussion of the importance of work and research in all languages. We will work to find research that talks about the complexity of language and how words cannot easily be translated. We will certainly cite the Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication (https://www.helsinki-initiative.org/) as a justification and guide for working in all languages to improve diversity.