Dear reviewers,

I would first like to thank you for engaging with my article so carefully and for your feedback, especially to reviewer one for sending such detailed suggestions. I briefly explain where/how I have addressed your concerns. I have adopted the majority of your suggestions, and where there is a disagreement that I don’t discuss in-text, I provide a response here. The page numbers refer to the page numbers in the document with track changes, unless specified otherwise.

Many thanks again and I look forward to hearing from you.

Kindly

**To reviewer 1:**

**- Feedback on word document:**

i) the time frame seems unnecessarily long and needlessly complex-> *Agreed, addressed in page 5*

ii) the human/animal division sits uncomfortably against the work’s base premise ‘(coanimal’ may work better-> *I use now the term coanimal in p. 1 and then make use of it all the way through, as suggested*;

iii) attention should be paid to occasional lapses in ‘scholarly tone’ for the ‘future article’-> *I have addressed most of these concerns as suggested on* the pdf*.*

iv) the implicit hierarchy between ‘DA’s and other nonhuman animals should be explicitly considered-> *In a different piece of scholarship I have distanced myself from Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka’s DAs/liminal animals divide. Hence, I don’t use the term DAs any longer in the text. Instead, I speak of nonhumans/nonhuman animals/coanimals. I have also deleted who would be granted citizenship (fn18). In a different piece of scholarship, I substantiate why insects should not be citizens, but only legal animals. Again, this argument requires much more space, and so I have avoided discussing who would be granted what rights, and have directed the reader to Donaldson and Kymlicka’s work.*

**Specific Comments:**

(I only address here the seven comments with which I am not in full agreement, work which are very few, considering that there are 59 comments! –the page numbers here refer to the annotated pdf)

* ‘Perhaps (given the complexities of the previous comment [in relation to post-hit], this world might well be seen as pre-Charter and post-Charter?’ (p.2)-> *I am sympathetic with this idea. In fact, I have used it to address a concern reviewer two had by referring to the times ‘before the Animals and Earth Charter.’ However, it seems to me that there is value in referring to the years’ post-hit because it implies that what drives change is not humans’ political will, but rather Earth itself. It is my contention that our system won’t dramatically change due to humans’ will. We will rather be forced by climate change to do so. Does this make sense?*
* ‘Would it be helpful to use some of the current phraseology such as rewilding/letting go (consider the best selling status of isabella Tree's Wilding for example?) (p.3)’-> *I am not familiar with isabella Tree’s Wilding. However, I know the field of conservation biology relatively well, and the issue of rewilding is very complex indeed. Many animals who are rewilded die in the process, and they can affect the ecological dynamics in a given ecosystem. Further, Donaldson and Kymlicka argue, successfully in my view, that nonhuman animals have a ‘right to be here,’ that is, to live in zoopolis. I don’t wish to suggest that we should abandon that discourse, but its use would probably require framing it in a traditionally academic fashion that might disrupt the narrative.*
* ‘This could be more layered, eg. that community leaders, previously known as guerilla gardeners, community gardeners, retirees, recently arrived communities from flooded countries with strong gardening expertise (?) might lead the charge - something that shows that the beginnings of this cultural turn were present in social change-makers that are already visible now?’(p.3)-> *my intention was to evoke a sense of horizontalisation, and suggest a more communal way to collaborate and learn. So, if the reviewer agrees, I would prefer not to suggest that some humans would lead this process.*
* ‘Could this have a counterweight here? 'However, even at this stage, emerging work on the benefits of recognising and benefiting from neurodiversity and ...' to flag to the reader (both the present and the imagined!) the progression? Disability studies and relared fields are rich sources for this trajectory’ (p.5)-> *While there might be some progress, I'd rather keep the pessimistic tone. The legal situation of people with disabilities (especially with cognitive disabilities) is appalling, and it is a by and large neglected issue. The counterweight could ease readers’ potential concerns and led them to think that we're on the right track because we're ‘progressing,’ which is unclear to me.*
* The sensitive but important imbrications of animal rights and race relations might need to be more carefully explored here. For example, this brilliant lecture from Syl Ko: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TWkTeeejS8k?*-*](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TWkTeeejS8k?-)(p.5)*> I was especially happy to receive this feedback. Many thanks for this wonderful reminder! I had watched Syl Ko's brilliant lecture several times before - and have watched it again. I have hopefully addressed this issue by engaging with Ko’s interview in Tier-Autonomie, where she discusses this matter*.
* On the issue of naming London as Zoolondopolis (p.7), I don’t r*eally suggest that it is a priority to change its name. I say that there are many proposals and one of them is to change London’s name. It seemed to me that it helps the story-line to establish a turning point from a homopolis to a zoopolis.*
* ‘The historical tone that this work begins with falls away here - there is no 'present' context. Perhaps it is enough to present this as a 'state of play' (so this paragraph begins in the 'present future' time:' The world is s still a grim place but this regional exemplar.....'?'’ (p. 12)-> *The aim of the last section is to be more evocative and emphasise the impossibility of moving beyond oppression altogether. As the narrator speaks in the 2150s, I’d prefer to keep the past tense. Perhaps in the 2150s the world will not be such a grim place?*

**To reviewer two:**

1. *Added in fn 5*

2. *Added in fn 6*

3. *Addressed in pp. 4-5*

4. *Addressed in p. 13.*

5. ‘I found some of the referencing a little obscure. I am thinking particularly of the references in the section at the top of p. 12. When, for example Wadiwel 2015 is referenced for the statement that others physically harmed animals. As this is proffered as a speculative claim, it is not clear what is being referenced. Perhaps footnotes in place of references with some explanation would be useful’-> *I have added the following: ‘Others physically harmed animals,* ***as it had happened before the Animals and Earth Charter*** *(Wadiwel 2015)’. My intention is to establish a continuity between what happens at present and the world envisaged in the article. Similarly, the other references at the top of previous p. 12, are preceded by ‘The* ***ancient*** *sexist culture of rape (MacKinnon 2016),’ which also seeks to establish a continuity between what happens in the current liberal-capitalist order and the future envisioned under liberalism and capitalism. My hope is that those remarks reiterate the idea that providing imaginaries that operate within the constraints of our economic and political system has important limits.*