

Review of: "Customary Land Tenure, Mining, and the Development Question: Insights From a Transitional State"

André Braz Golgher

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of the paper "Customary land tenure, mining, and the development question: insights from a transitional state"

The paper analyses an interesting topic that is the association of land tenure, mining activities and local development. Nonetheless, I found the paper very difficult to follow in some parts. Some sections were easier to understand. Maybe different authors wrote different sections. I also found that the sections are not well linked. In addition, I could not understand many definitions and acronyms. The paper needs a better linkage between the sources of information, including the interviews, and the points discussed. I will present some commentaries regarding each part of the paper.

The **Introduction** is very difficult to follow, as it is more a compilation of not linked sentences. In addition, it is too much detailed and long and it does not explain properly what was really done in the paper. If it is an analysis of in depth interviews and a literature review, this should be clear in the introduction. There are too many topics, the paper lacks focus, and the topics are not well interwoven. The introduction should be much shorter, direct, focused and less detailed.

In contrast, the **Conceptual Framework** is well written. However, it should be better linked with the rest of the paper. Why is it important? Who is Robert Chambers?

The **Literature Review** is also difficult to follow and it lacks focus. It should be merged with the **Introduction**, as there are many similarities. What is important for the paper? Maybe the topics covered by the paper should be divided in two papers. Why discuss gender issues here?

The **Methodology** is easier to follow, but insufficient. However, it is not clear why the authors chose the specific region to study. Most people do not know much about Zimbabwe. I would suggest including a map with the UMP location. How the authors chose the 88 households? Why 88?

The **Institutional framework** was easier to follow. Nonetheless, I would suggest a restructuration of the paper. Which part should come first?

The **Tenure, Mining and Development** part was easier to follow. Nevertheless, I could not understand many acronyms. Concrete examples should be given. Are they representative of a larger reality? A comparison between dry and wet regions would be interesting. When does the local community benefits from the mining activity and when it doesn't? More in depth discussion about mining activity and environmental impacts are needed. Again, there are too many topics being discussed and a more focused presentation should be made. Are the Chinese worse than others are? Can different areas

be compared?

I would like to congratulate the authors for the very interesting discussion. I truly believe that the paper can be greatly improved and can be an important source of information.