

Review of: "Stakeholders' Perception of Socioecological Factors Influencing Forest Elephant Crop Depredation in Gabon, Central Africa"

Sisay Hailu Gebretsadik¹

¹ Woldia University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear all editors, I thank you very much for inviting me to review this work entitled: **"Stakeholders' Perception of Socioecological Factors Influencing Forest Elephant Crop Depredation in Gabon, Central Africa."**

The title of the paper is very interesting for conservation issues of biodiversity, especially for the highly threatened species found in the world. However, I do have the following constructive comments **but still the Authors have not corrected as commented before:**

Introduction Part

- The scientific name of the Forest Elephant (~~Loxodonta cyclotis~~) should be written in the correct spelling and be italicized as (*Loxodonta cyclotis*).

Methodology Part - Interview Procedure

- It does not clearly show
 - how the villagers and from how many residences in the areas for interview were selected from the two villages?
 - how the villagers were grouped into two age groups?
- The paper tried to see the Human-Elephant conflicts in the study area, but the numbers of participants selected were too small to generalize the perceptions of the community.

Thus, it needs a standard way of selection or grouping of the participants of the study with certain reference from previous research works, and more participants should be included for interviews to generalize their perceptions.

Result Section – Participant Demographic Profile - Drivers Part

- There is a mismatch between the participants selected and involved for Stakeholders' Perception and the analysis made in the Drivers section, i.e
- Villagers and conservation professionals were the participants of the study, and all of the analysis focused on these two major participants for interviews to see their perceptions, but in the results section under the driver's part (line 4), three

results were mentioned. Here it is not clear from where the ~~interviewees (70%)~~ sourced.

- In the methodology section, 24 (52%) villagers and 22 (48%) professionals were selected for interviews, and there were no other participants for interviewees, but under the part mentioned above (i.e., Drivers), the statement about the most frequently identified driver of CDIs brought by ~~70% of interviewees, nearly equally by villagers (68%) and professionals (72%)~~ should be revised in detail; otherwise, it lacks consistency.
- Thus, on this occasion, I will not be more positive about it unless the manuscript (paper) tries to be more clarified on the method of participant selection, and there will be a correction to match the method with the participants involved and result analysis.