Stacks

Peer Review: Reconstructing the history and demise of the red wolf in Alabama: Insights from examining historical records and cultural perspectives

Jazmin J. Murphy[1], Amy C. Shutt[2], Aby Sène-Harper[3], & Joseph W. Hinton[1]

Collaborators: Jenna Parker and Kimberly Rivera

Accepted by 2 of 2 reviewers

Funding Information
This study was funded by the Wolf Conservation Center.

Conflicts of Interest
The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Publishing History
Submitted June 19 2024
Accepted May 7 2025
Published July 18 2025

Corresponding Author
Jazmin J. Murphy
sunny@nywolf.org

[1] Urban Wildlife Institute, Lincoln Park Zoo, 2001 N. Clark St. Chicago, IL 60614, USA
MF: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8583-0307
EL: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5748-6521
SM: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0275-3885

Transparent Peer Review

- View reviewer summaries
- View resubmission with reviewer comments
- View initial submission with reviewer comments and author responses

Recommended Citation

Murphy, J. J., Shutt, A. C., Sène-Harpe, A., & Joseph W. Hinton. (2025). Reconstructing the history and demise of the red wolf in Alabama: Insights from examining historical records and cultural perspectives. *Stacks Journal*: 25008. https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-25008

Reviewer Summaries

Jenna Parker

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 improvements from earlier versions are stark! The authors did a great job tackling a topic that is difficult to tackle because of pushback. I want to thank them for their determination. I also think the figures and tables are really great, especially the one that you can click on and get information on each point.

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

This research presents a greatly needed perspective on ultimate causes of our current biodiversity crisis. It also provides valuable information on the red wolf, and useful perspectives on how to start successfully bringing the species to recovery from a social-ecological perspective.

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

I think the study design and methods are well done.

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

I have provided a few reorganization suggestions that I think would improve the manuscript. These should not be difficult to incorporate.

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

I have suggested a few minor corrections; again these should be easy to address.

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

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

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

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?

It is hard to overstate how well the authors responded to my feedback. The new version is awesome!

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper is ready for publication
Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?
Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

Kimberly Rivera

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?
Curating the story and pairing down key components which were relevant to objectives.
How do you think this research will contribute to the field?
It will help build frameworks for future investigation of historical human dimensions and how that may impact the ecology and management infrastructure we see/use today. I also think it has direct management implications to the partners in this project and how to forward think on multi-disciplinary partnerships and stakeholder value.
Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?
I think this is 98% of the way there and authors just need to clarify on comments related to indigenous values and state boundaries.
Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?
I believe the analysis and interpretation are now clear.
Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?
See comments related to definitions and minor clarifications on methods.
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 and 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?
None
Based on your review, what should happen next?
This paper is ready for publication
Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?
Yes, please list me as a Collaborator