To the editor

* This manuscript is submitted as a perspective article. However, we are aware that it is going over the word count limit for this type of article. We tried to cut words to the best of our ability, considering the reviewer's comments and keeping the quality and integrity of the paper. We leave it to the editor to decide whether this manuscript qualifies as a review or could still be referred to as a perspective article despite the high word count.
* We have added five new references to the manuscript and corrected the reference list to make sure volume number in journal articles is in **Bold** and not *italic*.
* The in-text citation was previously ordered alphabetically, and we have now noticed that they appear in chronological order in other publications, so we have changed them accordingly.
* Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals appear 6 times in the manuscript and therefore introduced an abbreviation – EDC.
* We added a sentence to thank the reviewers in the acknowledgements.

We have attached the manuscript twice:

* One version contains all the changes we have made: Additions in highlighted in yellow; Deletions have their font coloured in ~~red with strikethrough~~.
* The second version is entirely clean.

**Reviewer 1**

1. When discussing the impacts of plastics, the paper points out several potential damages that plastics bring, such as habitats degradation, ingestion and entanglement, disease transmission, habitat changes and chemical additives to plastics. Even though this paper mentions that there are some **biological relationships between primates and humans, however, it lacks some structured classification.**

- We have added further explanation of this relationship in both the introduction section and added 2 references. We don’t see a need to classify this relationship rather than mentioning we share common ancestor and close phylogenetic relationship.

2. The classification of potential impacts could be more directional, for example, habitats degradation and habitats changes can be classified as geological impact while ingestion and entanglement, disease transmission can be divided into biological impact, and chemical additives to plastics can be recognized as chemical impacts. This classification will enhance the clarity of the conclusions and help readers consider the damages more broadly.

- We appreciate the suggestion to change the classification to clarify the conclusions. However, since geological, biological and the chemical additives interact with each other, it’s impossible to separate them. In other words, if an animal has “chemical impact” via a toxin in plastic - that is biological, too. And geological impacts have implications for biological ones too. We decided to keep the classification as it is for the purpose of this paper.

3. Besides, if the author could provide more quantitative data to support the argument, it could lend weight to the arguments and quantify the extent of the issues this paper discussed.

- There are very few studies out there. That’s part of the purpose of the manuscript in the first place. To raise awareness and get people (researchers) interested in studying plastic and its effects of primates, so data can then be generated.

**Reviewer 2**

The best way was the authors should give the most highest risk area of the plastic pollution for the most species richness of the primates, meanwhile, they need do the corelation analysis between risk rate and the pollution concentration.

This type of analysis is impossible at this point both because pollution concentration in

Although the authors supply a interesting problem about the primates species’ conservation depend on the environment issue, but it seemed lack of the more evidence and samples in the nature, they just give four or five species in the south America and southeast Asia and India, there were not the cancers or the reproductives samples, it seemed that more like the authors predictions.

* This paper may seem like a review, but it is written as a perspective article exactly because of its purpose to serve as an alarm/wake up call about a growing issue that there is lack of data about, lack of attention to and lack or understanding. The evidence that primates are interacting with plastic is sufficient and may be based on observation and not journal articles simply because it is not being looked at. The evidence of the consumption of plastic by primates in such articles are very few and even random findings. Which strengthens the argument that this wake-up call is necessary to encourage researchers to incorporate this in their primate field studies and create more data to address these concerns.

“Abstract section, The suggestion is that the authors should be focus on the main aim about the risk of the primates species faced on the plastic pollution.”

* **We do not understand this comment, what the reviewer means or how to address it.** We will refer to it as if the reviewer is asking to focus on the risks that plastic pollution is posing to primates. Overall, the abstract focuses on the aim of the paper, but we have expanded two sentences to clarify that primates and their habitats are the focus.

“In the introdcution part, the better way was that the authors should describe the plastic pollution risks on the different animals directly and clearly, and more better is give the more accurate data or examples.”

* For this paper, we have decided to focus on the impacts on primates and since they are closely related to humans, we are using the examples on how plastic is affecting human health rather than other non-primate animals.

“96-97 The spceices ammount of priamtes need to check, according to Russel et al, the number was more than 600 species, may include subspecies.”

* We used the number of primate species published in the IUCN SSC primate specialist group updated in 15 February 2023, according to which there are 533 species and 723 total taxa. To clarify we have added the number of taxa to this part.

See - <http://www.primate-sg.org/primate_diversity_by_region/>

“141-142 This study should be treated as the humanbeings, is it related with the primates species which lived in grassland or forests, it is more better that should point out clearly.”

* We do not understand this comment, what the reviewer means or how to address it. We have clarified that the contamination resulting from improper waste management can affect primate species living alongside ILC. As we have mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph that over 71% of primate species overlap with indigenous peoples lands.

“197-199 It is more better that should give the primates species which lived in the mangroves habitat.”

* We have added the number of primates which their habitats overlap with mangroves as well as the number of primates that directly use mangroves based on Hamilton et al. 2022.
* Added on row 196-197: Globally, ~50% of primate species with defined ranges potentially encounter mangrove forest in their habitat, and 147 species were observed to directly use it (Hamilton et al. 2022).

“216 MP is the abbrevation name of Microplastic? If so, need to point it clearly, like NHP means Nonhuman Primates.”

* This abbreviation MP for Microplastic was presented in the introduction in line 72. From there on we are using MP.

“226-227 Because the start of the sentence was As in marine wild life, but in the later, the authors said non marine animals also had the same things. Just like the before in the manuscript, the authors described that there were few studies for the land animals and less than the marine animals.”

* We do not understand this comment, what the reviewer means or how to address it.