Comments to the Author
Your paper is very well argued and makes very interesting points. I like the idea that the epistemic erasure of minoritised languages is perpetuated by researchers through their chosen methodologies and I could't agree more. However, I would have been even more convinced if you had allowed the reader to see the other side (your side) where you show how your own approaches to research on language policy yields results that are different from that research which promotes binary responses from participants.

I have explained my approach, engaged approach (David & Phyak 2016), in the beginning of the paper. I have discussed the processes and presented some relevant data that show my engagement with the participants where necessary. The revisions are marked blue.

The lived experiences of the people at the margins would perhaps come out and we would understand better why, when given to choose between Englsih and their indigenous language people seem to prefer English in the education of their children.

I have briefly mentioned the conditions where the participants live. I am hopeful that the revision helps to understand why and when aspects of choosing or not choosing English.

But as a reader I am  made to understand that one type of methodology is not so good, and some examples are given to support this point, but I don't get to see the other methodology at work and judge how good it is.I suggest that you add a little bit of the contrasting methodology which you claim to use for your own research.

I have described my own research approach and mentioned how it can generate in-depth and real perspectives from the participants, compared to binary survey questions which is the main critique of the paper.

Also be clear how you selected the statements that you base your arguemnts on.

I have added a footnote which describes that the statements I have used for the critique are drawn from my ongoing language policy advocacy work with indigenous communities, policymakers, researchers, youth, and teachers/teacher educators. These comments in this paper from a seminar organized for the policymakers, journalists and reseachers/teacher educators.

The methodological clarity will enhance the quality of the paper. Otherwise this is a very exciting contribution to the socioloy of language. Thank you.

Thank you for your kind words. I have tried my best to make methodology as clear as possible.