

# Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

First and foremost, we want to thank you for your invaluable comments and suggestions, which significantly improved the revised version of our manuscript.

We greatly value and appreciate the time and effort you put into reviewing our paper, as well as the insightful comments you provided. Here are our responses to your helpful comments and suggestions.

**Point 1:** Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?

**Response 1:** Yes, we have succinctly described the content succinctly described and contextualized it with respect to the previous and present theoretical background and empirical research on the topic in our revised manuscript.

**Point 2:** Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?

**Response 2:** Yes, we have improved and tried to make it coherent, balanced and compelling in our revised manuscript.

**Point 3:** For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?

**Response 3:** We have improved the results section slightly and tried to make it clearer.

**Point 4:** Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?

**Response 4:** Yes, we have improved the conclusion in our revised manuscript so that the conclusion is thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature.

**Point 5:** This paper currently reads more like a list of ecofeminist issues in This Mournable Body than an analysis that can point to larger critical issues around climate change, the allocation of resources, and the importance of combining feminist perspectives with eco-criticism. I think a strong introduction addressing the overall importance of this analysis would be helpful and would ground the analysis.

**Response 5:** Thank you very much for this comment. We have revised almost all the introduction part and tried to raise critical issues that ecofeminism as a theory addresses, from its inception to present-day discussions and arguments. We have also discussed the background of ecofeminism in an African context here. We don't mean we have included every detail about the arguments of ecofeminism because it is a very broad subject, and we have only focused on issues that can be a ground for our analysis of the novel. In this way, we have tried to address the connection between women and the natural environment and the various perceptions women and indigenous people have of the natural environment, and we have shown what nature means to those who live close to it. Besides, we have raised the impacts of neo-colonialism on women, nature, and the other indigenous people in present-day Africa. At last, there might be still a gap that we need to address, and we will try to make the research as complete and sound as possible.

**Point 6:** I'm unclear about the disciplinary home of this analysis as at times it sounds more like a social science paper than a humanities paper.

**Response 6:** Our focus is mainly to analyze the novel from ecofeminism literary perspective. On the other hand, as multidisciplinary field it focuses on humanities dependency on nature. Thus, we believe that it is possible to include it under the scope of humanities.

At last, we really appreciate your constructive comments and suggestions. Thank you so much.