

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_130261
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining the Efficacy of Compensation blueprints for Livestock, Human, and Crop losses in Zimbabwe's Human-Wildlife Conflict Hotspots.
Type of the Article	Academic Research Paper (Review Research Paper)

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Furthermore, this material will be a valuable document for the medical as well as biology fraternity as a review of the sprouting endowments for a human-wildlife conflict (HWC) management in Zimbabwe owing to its significance concerning more socio-economic and ecological distinctions. It reveals various challenges facing the entire system, such as funding gaps and procedural inefficiencies and the inadequate legislative regimen, which contribute significantly to the failure of the extant mitigatory tools to be effective. The research and resolved problems, including the national insurance fund and sound legislation, proffer effective actions for policy formulation, community resilience, and coexistence between humans and wildlife. This is a broader vision for management strategies in conflict-prone biodiversity hotspots that could particularly promote and enhance the future conceptualization for sibling habitats.	Thank you for your comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Present Research paper title is informative but could be refined for clarity, conciseness, and broader appeal.  Here's a suggested alternative: "Evaluating Compensation Strategies for Livestock, Human, and Crop Losses in Zimbabwe's Human-Wildlife Conflict Zones."	Topic wording remains unchanged since two of three reviewers supported it to remain.

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key aspects of the article, including the problem, methodology, findings, and recommendations. However, there is room for improvement to enhance clarity, coherence, and balance. Below are suggestions for refining the abstract:</p> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Balance between Background and Findings:</b></li><li><b>Highlight Specific Results:</b></li><li><b>Streamline Language:</b></li><li><b>End with a Strong Conclusion:</b></li></ol>	<p>Language in the abstract was refined to make it more understandable as suggested.</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is believed to represent valid scientific work and seeks a very important address with man-wildlife conflict (HWC) management. Its paragraphs contain within them a copious survey of the problems, methodologies, and potential resolutions as connected with compensation schemes in Zimbabwe. Below are some key elements on which its scientific accuracy is based and themes for potential amelioration:</p> <p>Strengths Indicating Scientific Accuracy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Thorough Literature Review:</b>  The manuscript cites a wide range of relevant literature, including both global and regional studies, which supports its claims and situates the research within a broader academic context.</li><li><b>Appropriate Methodology:</b>  The use of qualitative research methods, such as interviews with affected stakeholders, is appropriate for assessing perceptions, challenges, and the social implications of compensation schemes.</li><li><b>Well-Defined Findings:</b>  The findings are consistent with commonly reported challenges in HWC management: limited funding, poor administration, and lack of an established legal framework. This coherence with established knowledge corroborates the study's validity.</li><li><b>Actionable Recommendations:</b>  The manuscript offers specific, evidence-based recommendations (e.g., the establishment of a National Insurance Fund and legislative frameworks), which are practical and grounded in the study's findings.  The manuscript is scientifically sound and in line with theories and findings about conflict management between humans and wildlife. The use of qualitative data, with diverse stakeholder perceptions, strengthens the validity. Minor improvements in data presentation, recognition of bias, and contextual information on feasibility would further increase the scientific strength and practical applicability of the manuscript.</li></ol>	<p>Thank you for pointing out the strengths and the areas of improvement for the manuscript.</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p>	<p>Suggested references were incorporated to improve manuscript depth.</p>

Review Form 3

	<p>To enhance the manuscript's depth and recency, consider incorporating the following recent and relevant works:</p> <p>1. <b>Technological Innovations in HWC Mitigation:</b></p> <p>Pimm, S. L., Jenkins, C. N., &amp; Li, B. V. (2022). Innovations in managing human-wildlife conflict using technology. <i>Nature Communications</i>.</p> <p>2. <b>Global Perspectives on Compensation Mechanisms:</b></p> <p>Dickman, A. J., Hazzah, L., &amp; Madden, F. (2020). Compensation as a tool for mitigating human-wildlife conflict: Lessons learned and future directions. <i>Conservation Letters</i>.</p> <p>3. <b>Economic and Policy Dimensions:</b></p> <p>Treves, A., Chapron, G., &amp; López-Bao, J. V. (2021). Governance challenges in human-wildlife conflict management. <i>Biological Conservation</i>.</p> <p>4. <b>Community-Based Approaches:</b></p> <p>Barua, M., Bhagwat, S. A., &amp; Jadhav, S. (2021). The social dimensions of human-wildlife conflict: Case studies from India and Africa. <i>Human Ecology</i>.</p> <p>5. <b>Climate Change and HWC:</b></p> <p>Nyhus, P. J. (2023). Climate change and its implications for human-wildlife conflict. <i>Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment</i>.</p>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is often fittingly written for scholarly communication, but certain parts could improve clarity, conciseness, or be made easier to read. Although the manuscript clearly presents the principal messages, certain areas are, however, verbose, sometimes repetitively, and consist of long-winded, hard-to-follow sentences.	Thank you.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	