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**Overall Response**

I am grateful for the comments from both reviewers and the series editor.

Based on the review comments, I am committed to three major tasks to improve the current manuscript. First is clarifying and further elaborating the concept of inversion and its consistent application/development throughout the chapters. The second is more clearly connecting the discussion with the existing literature on climate and environmental politics. The third is to ensure a consistent style of storytelling and level of academic engagement.

**For the first**, I will “define the types/characteristics of inversion” (PR 2), beginning in the introduction. I thank the PR2 for hinting at multiple categories of inversions focusing on their subjects, i.e., who/what causes inversion, calling for a systematic clarity of the concept. My primary emphasis has been on “state-led” inversions, but I will think more explicitly about other possible categories and how they might emerge differently from state-led inversions to offer a more systematic treatment (PR2). These will be defined in the introduction and may be developed in subsequent chapters. If the cases in the US do not add anything particular and important, they may be erased.

Following the suggestions of PR1 (which was supported by the series editor), I will further elaborate on the various levels of manifestation where inversion can be observed. I will pay specific attention to the nature of the government (democratic vs authoritarian) as well as the economic status of a country, and add a discussion in the concluding chapter.

I will also make it explicit that avoiding inversion and restoring *from* inversions are different areas of action that must be distinguished. The case of Japan will be treated as an example of the former, i.e., how to avoid future inversion through democratizing environmental knowledge. Community-based resource development can be placed as an example of the latter where state-led interventions have occurred in the past. In this way, there will be a stronger coherence among the chapters and clarity in the sequence of the discussions.

In the recent article published on *Nature Sustainability* (Conceptualizing just transition litigation. Nature Sustainability, 2024; DOI: [10.1038/s41893-024-01439-y](https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=http%3a%2f%2fdx.doi.org%2f10.1038%2fs41893-024-01439-y&c=E,1,fad_uxncOJK7Lzoc7sdVjv8V1ddhTKGSIkDl31iZhPZolWyh1RPi7zG-N9g7DsJEZjbb9B9LdDqoSxmY3k1F0brPMK9kw0DbnyV1j2rW1W6c1vNm&typo=1)), there was a provocation of the meaning of environmental justice. I think I can locate “inversion” as a transitional phenomenon where the movement toward environmental conservation incurs costs to the weaker section of society. My contribution is to crystalize how such costs are made invisible, and how they arise despite ‘goodwill’ / altruistic motives (for example in comparison to the realism of developmental states).

**For the second,** I will establish a conversation with Karl Polanyi and Ivan Illich who employed the idea of “disembedding” in connection with the market economy. I will guide readers toward an alternative solution-oriented discussion to question where disembedded people can be re-rooted and find belonging in a modern way. My chapter on intermediary groups points to the exact “level” where such an alternative might materialize to avoid inversion and maintain distance from state power. Community-based resource initiatives introduced in chapters 3 (irrigation in Indonesia) and 4 (fisheries in Cambodia) are re-positioned as examples of such moves. This is closest to PR1’s “option two,” following a central focus on how inversion has occurred across (South) East Asia.

**For the third**, I recognize the need “to sharpen the storyline” (series editor). Clarifying the concepts and considering the exact contribution of each chapter will support a better structure, and will better balance empirical discussion of fieldwork and theory development. At this stage, I will hand over to a freelance developmental editor to assist with organization and storytelling. This might also help to make explicit the work’s contribution to basing action on “under-represented and unheard voices” (PR1).

**Chapter Specific Responses:**

Ch.1 Mechanisms: From Dominance over nature to dominance over people:

・I will be more explicit on the link between my argument and the literature on “right to development” (PR2).

・Following the advice from the series editor, I will streamline the choices of cases to sharpen the storyline. I will 1) reorganize the examples I use to support the case of inversions led by non-state actors (e.g., in the case of intellectual property rights) and add a new section on “variations,” and 2) possibly delete the US examples and instead add discussion on the similarities and differences between advanced and developing countries within Asia (PR1).

Ch.2 Exclusion: Comparative History of environmental states in Japan and Thailand:

・I will more clearly articulate **why** history matters in understanding the evolution of inversions.

Ch.6 Intermediaries: Promise and Challenge of Groups in Between:

・I will engage with more recent discussions on civil society in Asia (e.g. Ogawa, *Routledge Handbook of Civil Society in Asia,* etc.) as suggested by PR 2.

・I will update and articulate the relevance of my argument in relation to some of the literature highlighted by PR1 on *Greening East Asia* etc.

**Organization and Consistency**

I will hire a freelance editor to address some of the points addressed by the reviewers such as paragraph composition, grammar, and headings.

For stylistic matters, I will work with the above editor to address concerns raised by PR2 such as paragraphing.

I will also follow the suggestion of PR1 on limiting the questions addressed in the book (especially those that are unanswered).

**Writing Schedule**

I plan to submit the revised manuscript, addressing all the points above, by March 31, 2025