

Supplementary Information

Supplementary Discussion

To investigate the use of references written in different languages, we selected the most relevant report in each country/territory based on pre-defined criteria (i.e., 37 reports in total). However, considering the possibility that the selected report for each country/territory may not be representative of other eligible reports in the country/territory in terms of English-language literature usage, we conducted a sensitivity analysis, focusing on 11 countries/territories (Czech Republic, France, Guatemala, Hungary, Japan, Paraguay, Romania, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, and Taiwan) where we had also recorded the number, type and language of references cited in other eligible reports that were not used in the analysis (the number of such reports ranged from one to 40, with a median of four).

The proportion of non-English-language literature cited varied greatly among reports within each country (Extended Data Fig. 7). However, in six out of 11 countries, the mean proportion of non-English-language references (academic and grey literature combined) cited in other eligible reports was higher than the proportion in the report used in the analysis (i.e., red diamonds are above the line labelled “100%” in Extended Data Fig. 7a). In the remaining five countries, the mean proportion of non-English-language references in other eligible reports was lower than that in the report used in the analysis but only by up to 25% (i.e., red diamonds are above the line labelled “75%” in Extended Data Fig. 7a).

Similarly, the mean proportion of non-English-language academic literature cited in other eligible reports was higher than the proportion in the report used in the analysis in seven out of 11 countries, lower but only by up to 25% in two countries, lower but by within 50% in a country, and lower by more than 50% in one country (Extended Data Fig. 7b).

This result indicates that in most countries, the proportion of non-English-language literature cited in the reports used in the analysis does not necessarily overestimate the proportions in other eligible reports. In over half of the countries investigated here, the prevalence of non-English-language literature was even higher in other eligible reports. In most of the other countries, the mean proportion of non-English-language literature in other eligible reports was only slightly lower than, and within 25% of, the proportion in the report used in the analysis.

We thus believe that our main conclusion that the use of non-English-language literature in national biodiversity assessments is widespread, is not sensitive to the choice of reports used in the analysis.

Supplementary Text 1. Questionnaire survey on the use of references in different languages in national biodiversity assessment reports.

Participant Information Sheet

Survey on the use of scientific literature in domestic reports on biodiversity and its conservation

The purpose of the study

Our recent work showed that up to 35% of scientific literature on biodiversity conservation is published in languages other than English ([Amano et al 2016 PLOS Biology](#)). Nevertheless, it is still largely unknown how such non-English-language literature has been used in environmental evidence syntheses at global (e.g., in assessments conducted by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) and national levels (e.g., in domestic reports).

This study aims to understand the use of English-language and non-English-language scientific literature in domestic reports on biodiversity and its conservation, published in countries where English is not widely spoken. We have already identified such domestic reports on biodiversity and its conservation in various countries, including those that you authored/edited/published. We would thus be grateful if you could fill in this survey to help us understand how and why references in different languages were identified and cited in the report you authored/edited/published.

What is involved?

Participation in this study is entirely online and will take approximately 15 minutes and the survey can be undertaken at a time and place that is convenient to you.

Participation and withdrawal

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without prejudice or penalty. If you wish to withdraw, simply stop completing the survey and decide not to send it back to the person who contacted you. Feel free to ask any questions about the research (contact the project coordinator).

Risks

Participation in this study should involve no physical or mental discomfort, and no risks beyond those of everyday living. If, however, you should find any question to be invasive or offensive, you are free to omit answering or participating in that aspect of the study.

Confidentiality and security of data

Your responses to the survey are anonymous; no identifying information will be collected. All other data will be stored on password protected computers and only members of the research team will have access to the data. Because all data is non-identifiable, it cannot be linked to individual participants and data will only be presented as summaries of overall responses. The data you provide will only be used for the specific research purposes of this study.

Benefits of your participation in the study:

The data from the survey will shed light on the role of non-English-language literature in domestic policy-making for biodiversity conservation, as well as consequences of language barriers to the use of English-written scientific knowledge in domestic policy-making.

Consent form

Please take the time to read the project information that is provided on the previous page. Your participation is voluntary, and you can choose to withdraw at any point. You will not be asked to give your name so any information you provide is completely anonymous. Should you wish to clarify any aspect of your potential participation or need more information you can also speak directly to a lead researcher before agreeing or disagreeing to take part in the evaluation.

If you understand the purpose of the research project and the nature of your involvement, then please complete the following:

- ☐ I have read the information provided about the research project and understand the nature of my involvement. I understand any information I provide is completely confidential. I agree to take part and understand I can withdraw at any time.
- ☐ I am over 18 years of age.

Ethics Clearance and Contacts

This study has been cleared in accordance with the ethical review guidelines and processes of the

University of Queensland. These guidelines are endorsed by the University's Human Ethics Committee and registered with the Australian Health Ethics Committee as complying with the National Statement. You are free to discuss your participation in this study with project staff (contactable at t.amano@uq.edu.au). If you would like to speak to an officer of the University not involved in the study, you may contact the University of Queensland Ethics Officer on 07 3365 3924.

If you would like to learn the outcome of the study in which you are participating, please feel free to email t.amano@uq.edu.au and we can organise to send you a summary of the study once it is complete. You can also obtain general information on the project at: <https://translatesciences.com/>.

Thank you for your participation in this study.

Dr Tatsuya Amano, ARC Future Fellow	Violeta Berdejo Espinola, Senior Research Technician
School of Biological Sciences	School of Biological Sciences
The University of Queensland	The University of Queensland
Brisbane, Qld 4072	Brisbane, Qld 4072
Email: t.amano@uq.edu.au	Email: v.berdejoespinola@uq.edu.au

Questionnaire survey on the use of scientific literature in national reports on biodiversity and its conservation

Section A

Q1. Which sector do you work in (please choose only one)?

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| National government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| State/provincial/regional government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Government research institution | <input type="checkbox"/> |

124 Not-for-profit organization ☐

125 Private business ☐

126 Academic institution or university ☐

127 Other (please describe): _____

128

129

130 Q2. Which aspect of biodiversity conservation does your role predominantly focus on (please choose
131 only one)?

132

133 Policy ☐

134 On-ground management ☐

135 Research ☐

136 Other (please describe, e.g., if your role spans across these aspects):

137 _____

138

139

140 Q3. Please circle the (approximate) number of years you have been involved in conservation (either
141 in on-ground management, research, or policy advice, or any combination)

142

143 <1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

144 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 >30

145

146 Q4. Please state your first language(s): here a first language is defined as “the language that you
147 spoke most at home when you were at age 3-18”.

148

149

150 Q5. How easy is it for you to read and understand the full text of an English-language peer-reviewed
151 paper on biodiversity conservation?

152

153 Very easy ☐

- 154 Easy ☐
- 155 Neutral ☐
- 156 Difficult ☐
- 157 Very difficult ☐

158

159

160 **Section B.**

161 Q6. If you cited **non-English-language peer-reviewed literature** (i.e., papers published in academic
 162 peer-reviewed journals) in your report, please select reason(s) for citing it/them (select all that
 163 apply to the majority of the non-English-language peer-reviewed literature cited).

164

165 It was easy to find when searching for relevant literature ☐

166 It was easy to access (e.g., open access, hard copies available, had a journal subscription) ☐

167 The content was easy to understand to you and/or other editors of the report ☐

168 It would be easy for the readers of the report to understand ☐

169 It was recommended by someone else (e.g., experts in a relevant field) ☐

170 You already knew about it before writing the report ☐

171 It was from a widely-recognised source (e.g., published in a well-known academic journal) ☐

172 It contained information you were specifically looking for ☐

173 (e.g., important information on particular species in the country)

174 Information provided in the literature was of high quality and thus reliable ☐

175 (e.g., based on a rigorous study)

176 I did not cite non-English-language peer-reviewed literature in my report ☐

177 Other (please describe): _____

178

179

180 Q7. If you cited **non-English-language grey literature** (e.g., governmental/NGO reports, databases,
181 websites, theses etc) in your report, please select reason(s) for citing it/them (select all that
182 apply to the majority of the non-English-language grey literature cited).

183 It was easy to find when searching for relevant literature ☐

184 It was easy to access (e.g., open access, hard copies available, had a journal subscription) ☐

185 The content was easy to understand to you and/or other editors of the report ☐

186 It would be easy for the readers of the report to understand ☐

187 It was recommended by someone else (e.g., experts in a relevant field) ☐

188 You already knew about it before writing the report ☐

189 It was from a widely-recognised source (e.g., published in a well-known academic journal) ☐

190 It contained information you were specifically looking for ☐

191 (e.g., important information on particular species in the country)

192 Information provided in the literature was of high quality and thus reliable ☐

193 (e.g., based on a rigorous study)

194 I did not cite non-English-language grey literature in my report ☐

195 Other (please describe): _____

196

197

198 Q8. If you cited **English-language peer-reviewed literature** (i.e., papers published in academic peer-
199 reviewed journals) in your report, please select reason(s) for citing it/them (select all that apply
200 to the majority of the English-language peer-reviewed literature cited).

201 It was easy to find when searching for relevant literature ☐

202 It was easy to access (e.g., open access, hard copies available, had a journal subscription) ☐

203 The content was easy to understand to you and/or other editors of the report ☐

- 204 It would be easy for the readers of the report to understand ☐
- 205 It was recommended by someone else (e.g., experts in a relevant field) ☐
- 206 You already knew about it before writing the report ☐
- 207 It was from a widely-recognised source (e.g., published in a well-known academic journal) ☐
- 208 It contained information you were specifically looking for ☐
- 209 (e.g., important information on particular species in the country)
- 210 Information provided in the literature was of high quality and thus reliable ☐
- 211 (e.g., based on a rigorous study)
- 212 I did not cite English-language peer-reviewed literature in my report ☐
- 213 Other (please describe): _____
- 214
- 215
- 216 Q9. If you cited **English-language grey literature** (e.g., governmental/NGO reports, databases,
217 websites, theses etc) in your report, please select reason(s) for citing it/them (select all that
218 apply to the majority of the English-language grey literature cited).
- 219
- 220 It was easy to find when searching for relevant literature ☐
- 221 It was easy to access (e.g., open access, hard copies available, had a journal subscription) ☐
- 222 The content was easy to understand to you and/or other editors of the report ☐
- 223 It would be easy for the readers of the report to understand ☐
- 224 It was recommended by someone else (e.g., experts in a relevant field) ☐
- 225 You already knew about it before writing the report ☐
- 226 It was from a widely-recognised source (e.g., published in a well-known academic journal) ☐
- 227 It contained information you were specifically looking for ☐

228 (e.g., important information on particular species in the country)

229 Information provided in the literature was of high quality and thus reliable ☐

230 (e.g., based on a rigorous study)

231 I did not cite English-language grey literature in my report ☐

232 Other (please describe): _____

233

234

235 Q10. Did you encounter any difficulties when **searching for English-language literature** for your
236 report because the source was written in English? (e.g., difficult to understand how to use a
237 literature search engine)

238

239 Yes ☐

240 No ☐

241 If yes, please describe your difficulties:

242

243

244

245

246 Q11. Did you encounter any difficulties when trying to **understand English-language literature** for
247 your report because it was written in English? (e.g., difficult to understand a paper written in
248 English)

249

250 Yes ☐

251 No ☐

252 If yes, please describe your difficulties:

253

254

255

256 Q12. Was there any **English-language literature** that you found or knew already that looked
257 relevant to your report but you decided not to cite because you found it difficult to understand
258 the content written in English?

259

260 Yes ☐

261 No ☐

262 Unsure ☐

263

264

265 Q13. Do you think that your report could be improved (i.e., more detailed, more accurate, better
266 quality, or better coverage) if you had used more **English-language references**?

267

268 Yes ☐

269 No ☐

270 Unsure ☐

271

272

273 Q14. Do you think that your report could be improved (i.e., more detailed, more accurate, better
274 quality, or better coverage) if you had used more **non-English-language references**?

275

276 Yes ☐

277 No ☐

278 Unsure ☐

279

280

281 Q15. What type of review did you use to search for **non-English-language references** cited in your
282 report? (select all that apply)

283

284 Personal knowledge ☐

285 (e.g., only cited references that you and/or other editors of the report knew)

286 Expert opinion ☐

287 (e.g., most references recommended by a limited number of experts
288 other than those who authored/edited the report)

289 Formal consultation process ☐

290 (e.g., widely asked for the identification of relevant literature
291 from a wider expert community)

292 Casual or narrative review ☐

293 (e.g., looked at several relevant studies and used literature cited in those studies)

294 Systematic review ☐

295 (e.g., systematically screened all relevant literature
296 with certain keywords in one or more literature search engine)

297 Other (please describe):

298

299

300

301 Q16. What type of review did you use to search for **English-language references** cited in your
302 report? (select all that apply)

303

304 Personal knowledge ☐

305 (e.g., only cited references that you and/or other editors of the report knew)

306 Expert opinion ☐

307 (e.g., most references recommended by a limited number of experts
308 other than those who authored/edited the report)

309 Formal consultation process ☐

310 (e.g., widely asked for the identification of relevant literature
311 from a wider expert community)

312 Casual or narrative review ☐

313 (e.g., looked at several relevant studies and used literature cited in those studies)

314 Systematic review ☐

315 (e.g., systematically screened all relevant literature

316 with certain keywords in one or more literature search engine)

317 Other (please describe):

318

319

320

321 **Section C.**

322 Q17. If all English-language scientific literature (e.g., papers published in English-language academic
323 journals) had **the title and abstract also available in your first language**, do you think that would
324 have made it easier and quicker to **search and identify** relevant literature for your report?

325

326 Yes ☐

327 No ☐

328 Unsure ☐

329

330

331 Q18. If all English-language scientific literature (e.g., papers published in English-language
332 academic journals) had the **title, abstract and full text also available in your first language**, do
333 you think that would have made it easier and quicker to **search and identify** relevant literature
334 for your report?

335

336 Yes ☐

337 No ☐

338 Unsure ☐

339

340

341 Q19. If all English-language scientific literature (e.g., papers published in English-language
342 academic journals) had the **title and abstract also available in your first language**, do you think
343 that would have made it easier and quicker to **understand** relevant literature for your report?

344

345 Yes ☐

346 No ☐

347 Unsure ☐

348

349

350 Q20. If all English-language scientific literature (e.g., papers published in English-language
351 academic journals) had the **title, abstract and full text also available in your first language**, do
352 you think that would have made it easier and quicker to **understand** relevant literature for your
353 report?

354

355 Yes ☐

356 No ☐

357 Unsure ☐

358

359

360 Q21. Did you use machine translation (e.g., Google Translate) when searching and/or reading
361 English-language literature for your report?

362

363 Always (~100%) ☐

364 Often (~75%) ☐

365 Sometimes (~50%) ☐

366 Rarely (~25%) ☐

367 Never (~0%) ☐

368

369

370 Q22. If you used machine translation when searching and/or reading English-language literature
371 for your report, please state the translation service you used.

372

373

374

375 Q23. Do you think that machine translation (e.g., Google Translate) helps you **search** relevant
376 English-language literature for your report?

377

378 Yes ☐

379 No ☐

380 Unsure ☐

381

382

383 Q24. If you do **NOT** think that machine translation helps you **search** relevant English-language
384 literature, please select reason(s) for why you think so (select all that apply):

385

386 Machine translation is not high quality enough (e.g., it doesn't translate well) ☐

387 It is time-consuming to use ☐

388 (e.g., need to copy and paste relevant sentences into the service)

389 It cannot be effectively used for searching literature ☐

390 (e.g., not integrated into literature search engines)

391 I don't know how to use it ☐

392 Other (please describe):

393

394

395 Q25. Does machine translation (e.g., Google Translate) help you **understand** relevant English-
396 language literature

397

398 Yes ☐

399 No ☐

400 Unsure ☐

401

402

403 Q26. If you do **NOT** think that machine translation helps you **understand** relevant English-language
404 literature, please select reason(s) for why you think so (select all that apply):
405

406 Machine translation is not high quality enough (e.g., it doesn't translate well) ☐

407 It is time-consuming to use ☐

408 (e.g., need to copy and paste relevant sentences into the service)

409 It cannot be effectively used for reading literature ☐

410 (e.g., it cannot be used for hard copies)

411 I don't know how to use it ☐

412 Other (please describe):

413

414

415 Do you have any other comments about the use of English- or non-English-language literature for your
416 work in biodiversity conservation and management?

417

418

419

420

421

422

423 Thank you very much for your time!

424

425 Please visit our website (<https://translatesciences.com/>) for the detail of our translatE project.