

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_123371
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Human-Wildlife Conflict: A Case Study of Kothale Village in the Kalsubai Harishchandragad Wildlife Sanctuary (KHWS), Maharashtra (India)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Investigating human-wildlife conflict (HWC) is essential for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem health, and protecting local livelihoods. The study could be key in mitigating risks to human safety and informs sustainable development policies that promote coexistence. Overall, such research has potential for fostering harmony between human activities and wildlife preservation. A good piece of investigation	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable. There is clarity on the research topic. It clearly indicates on the study research focus and specificity.	
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.	Please consult the manuscript for concrete suggestions. Key among the limitations is the following: (1) limited reference to the methodology, and (2) no reference to the exact data analysis followed, (3) Methodology lacks clarity. Sample size. Criteria used to draw the sample which at this point is not clear. (4) The aim of the study is not clearly stated. Its confusing. (5) No mention to recommendations and key findings (6) Abstract is too long (7) Who actually participated in the study?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is need for (1) acknowledgements (2) Limitations of the study (3) Declaration of conflict of interest (4) recommendations	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The section requires major revision. The following are considered limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location: Provide the reader with a bit of context to understand the unique geographical area where the study was conducted. • Research approach: There is need for clarity on the research approach • Data collection: Be specific in which language(s) data was collected and also whether the transcripts had to be translated. Since there is mention of interviews, there is need for all the quotations. Explain the operationalisation of the data collection in more detail and provide in-text references. • Sampling: Provide the inclusion criteria for participant recruitment. Who participated? Main participants and the key informants. • Data analysis: Reference is very vague. The specific process – within the context of the study reported on – should be identified and discussed with appropriate referencing. • Trustworthiness: The author(s) fails to demonstrate how the criteria for trustworthiness were met and the strategies that were employed to ensure data quality. In the absence of a dedicated section to trustworthiness, the findings and discussion remain tentative. • Ethical considerations: It is not indicated where and how ethical clearance was obtained to implement the study. • Study limitations: Consider providing this information towards the end of the 'discussion'-section. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. _	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References are descent. The author could also refer to other studies on human wildlife conflict for comparison 	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article requires substantial language and technical editing and overall scholarly enhancement as indicated in the reviewer report to meet the standards for publication in a scientific journal	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charles Simbarashe Gozho
Department, University & Country	Midlands State University, Zimbabwe