

Peer Review: “Although elephants bring problems, they also bring benefits:” The complexities of human-wildlife coexistence

Leandra Merz¹, Jessica Kahler², Gilbert Mwale³, & Brian Child⁴

Collaborators: Chase LaDue, Michelle Lute, Jenny MacPherson, & Lara Mengak

Credibility score

100%

Accepted by 4 of 4 reviewers

Funding information

This research was funded by University of Florida’s Center for African Studies and Tropical Conservation and Development Program.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Publishing history

Submitted 28 December 2023

Accepted 22 May 2024

Published 03 July 2024

Corresponding author

Leandra Merz

DrLeandraMerz@gmail.com



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons

¹ University of Florida Geography Department-Turlington Hall, 3141, 330 Newell Dr, Gainesville, FL, 32611, USA.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2356-7483>

² University of Florida Department of Sociology and Criminology & Law-Turlington Hall, 330 Newell Dr. Gainesville, FL, 32611, USA.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3963-5196>

³ Frankfurt Zoological Society, North Luangwa Conservation Programme, P.O. Box 450189, Musakanya drive, Mpika, Zambia

⁴ University of Florida Geography Department- Turlington Hall, 3141, 330 Newell Dr, Gainesville, FL, 32611, USA.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0532-2127>

Transparent Peer Review

- **[View reviewer summaries](#)**
- **[View resubmission with reviewer comments](#)**
- **[View initial submission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)**

Recommended Citation

Merz, L., Kahler, J., Mwale, G., & Child, B. (2024). “Although elephants bring problems, they also bring benefits:” The complexities of human-wildlife coexistence. *The Stacks*: 24001. <https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-24001>



Reviewer Summaries

Chase LaDue

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

The authors did a good job of carefully explaining the meaning of each of their results, along with providing potential implications in the discussion section. Most everything was very thorough.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

I was most interested to find that positive perceptions for wildlife are not necessarily correlated to tolerance. Often, studies assume that one of these promotes or causes the other, but this study indicates this isn't the case. Future studies should use this article to carefully evaluate their methods and conclusions.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

The statistics and figures were rather straightforward, but there are some summary statistics throughout the Results section that should be provided whenever possible (and when not demonstrated elsewhere in a table or figure). I've indicated a few of these in my comments on the manuscript.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

I encourage the authors to consider how broadly applicable their findings are, given the site-specific nature of human-wildlife conflict.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

no

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

no

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Accept

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

None--I think the authors responded appropriately to all reviewer feedback.

What else do the authors need to fix for this article to be ready for publication?

Nothing--I think this publication is now suitable for publication.



If the authors make these changes, will the article be ready for publication?

Yes

Should this article be published?

Yes - accept with the revisions I mentioned

Do you need to see the article again before it gets published?

No - I don't need to see it again

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

Michelle Lute

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

clear, concise writing; appropriate methodology

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

Yes

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

N/A

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

tighter alignment between discussion and results

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

more analyses of qualitative data

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Revise & Resubmit

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

Some of their conclusions are tenuously related to their results. 1) My comment re: "These findings do not align with previous studies (e.g. Bruskotter et al., 2015) that demonstrate a strong relationship between attitudes and acceptance." was not adequately addressed. 2) Their argument re: intrinsic value and economic benefits lacks rationale. 3) Their conflation of coexistence and tolerance is problematic.

What else do the authors need to fix for this article to be ready for publication?



N/A

If the authors make these changes, will the article be ready for publication?

Yes

Should this article be published?

Yes - accept with the revisions I mentioned

Do you need to see the article again before it gets published?

No - I don't need to see it again

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

Jenny MacPherson

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

The paper is really well explained with a good amount of background to the study. The methods and results are clearly set out and the discussion is thorough. The conclusions are well justified.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

The methods are well applied and are an interesting addition to those usually used in this field

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

My only comment is that the authors classify tolerance in some cases where the respondent has had no negative experience of a species, whereas this is often defined as being tolerant despite having had a negative experience of an animal

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

I commend the authors on their thorough analysis and interpretation of the findings

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

I would only suggest a final proof read as I noticed a couple of missing words in sentences that I ascribed to typos

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

The ethics of the study were well explained and I have no concerns

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Accept

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

5/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?



there seem to be a couple of comments that still need addressing but these relate to typos rather than anything significant

What else do the authors need to fix for this article to be ready for publication?

proof read and correct the typos flagged up and one query from another reviewer

If the authors make these changes, will the article be ready for publication?

Yes

Should this article be published?

Yes - accept with the revisions I mentioned

Do you need to see the article again before it gets published?

No - I don't need to see it again

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

Lara Mengak

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

The authors provide an interesting study that examines tolerance in the context of wildlife attitudes.

Overall, the paper is well laid-out, generally easy to follow, and interesting.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

The research contributes to the field by exploring how tolerance of wildlife varies by species and with varying attitudes towards those species.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

The study design and methods are well done. How tolerance was measured needs to be made more clear in the methods. How species were ranked also needs to be more clear (i.e., what does high vs. low rank mean). How or if additional open-ended responses were analyzed or coded needs to be included in the methods.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

More examples from participants would strengthen the findings in the results. Certain topics in the discussion, like wildlife governance, are not backed up by the study itself and should not be included. Additionally, the relationship between education and attitudes is not one-to-one (i.e., increasing education does not always equate to increasing positive attitudes), and without citations from the literature, these claims should not be included. In general, the discussion section would benefit from having more citations from the literature.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

It would be beneficial for the discussion to focus more explicitly on tolerance and how their study could contribute to the broader understanding of wildlife tolerance. The authors discuss costs and benefits quite a bit, but the results right now do not explicitly touch on those concepts. It would be great to dive into the qualitative responses more and strengthen this part of the discussion.



Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Revise & Resubmit

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

5/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

I feel like the authors did a great job responding to comments and clarifying sections in their paper

What else do the authors need to fix for this article to be ready for publication?

Nothing major

If the authors make these changes, will the article be ready for publication?

Yes

Should this article be published?

Yes - accept with the revisions I mentioned

Do you need to see the article again before it gets published?

No - I don't need to see it again

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator