

# **Peer Review: Invasive wild pig movement and space use in a mixed-use forest landscape, South Carolina**

Erin K. Buchholtz<sup>1</sup> , Andrew Jamison<sup>2</sup>, & Greg Yarrow<sup>2</sup>

*Collaborators: Alex Jensen, Derek Risch + 3 other reviewers*

---

**Accepted by 5 of 5 reviewers**

## **Funding Information**

Clemson University Institute for Parks and the Clemson University Creative Inquiries program

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## **Publishing History**

Submitted June 12 2025

Accepted October 16 2025

Published December 11 2025

## **Corresponding Author**

Erin K. Buchholtz  
ekbuchh@clemson.edu



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, South Carolina Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit, Clemson, SC, USA

<sup>2</sup> Clemson University, Department of Forestry & Environmental Conservation, Clemson, SC, USA

## **Transparent Peer Review**

- **[View reviewer summaries](#)**
- **[View resubmission with reviewer comments](#)**
- **[View initial submission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)**

## **Recommended Citation**

Buchholtz, E.K., A. Jamison, and G. Yarrow. 2025. Invasive wild pig movement and space use in a mixed-use forest landscape, South Carolina. Stacks Journal: 25014. <https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-25014>.



# Reviewer Summaries

## Matthew Gentle

### 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?**

Providing clear methods and limiting discussion to results (ie no overreach)

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

Providing access to an additional dataset for consideration in any feral pig movement study. This will be important for ecological and management outcomes - ie disease spread.

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

The design is basically fine. The methods will need some revision for clarity.

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

Analysis is fine pending addressing some minor clarifications. Interpretation is also basically fine and sticks to the data.

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

Mainly textual. Some movement of text from the results to the methods. I don't have an issue with the introduction as it stands - brevity is required for such a data paper.

**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?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

**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?**

**Based on your review, what should happen next?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

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

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator



## Alex Jensen

### 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 authors did a great job describing their methods and I really like figure 1.

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

Wild pigs are notoriously difficult to track so data on their movement/space use is important.

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

There isn't really a study design. The authors need to make sure all the methods are in the methods section.

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

The authors should discuss how their findings compare to other studies on wild pig space use.

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

Like another reviewer said, improve the introduction and discussion.

**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?**

This paper needs major revisions and another round of peer review

### 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

## Derek Risch

### 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 authors did a good job designing and implementing this research. They have been transparent about data limitations and potential biases. I also appreciate the attention to data cleaning and quality control to allow for reliable use by future researchers.

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

This research makes a valuable contribution to the broader field of spatial ecology and more specifically to understanding spatial dynamics of invasive wild pigs. By providing a publicly available dataset, this research allows future researchers to explore broader questions about wild pig spatial ecology across diverse landscapes and ecosystems ultimately providing important insights that will benefit their management and control more broadly.

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

The primary issues and concerns with the current draft of this research is unclear reporting of both the methods and the results. Much of the content currently presented as ""results"" is actually a continuation of the methods. I recommend the authors restructure these sections to make a clear distinction between what was done and what was observed.

In addition, the authors should be more explicit in describing how the data were processed and cleaned. The general approach described seems sound but the lack of detail makes it hard to adequately understand how data were treated. This is especially important for data papers to ensure future interested researchers are familiar with the data.

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

Because this is a data paper rather than a hypothesis-driven study, formal interpretation of results is minimal. However, the concluding section could be strengthened by expanding on the broader relevance and potential applications of the dataset. Currently, the narrative is overly focused on site-specific uses, and undersells the utility of these data for understanding wild pig behavior in other ecologically similar systems.

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

**Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?**

No, the authors clearly state that the research was conducted under the appropriate animal use protocol.

**Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?**

This paper needs major revisions and another round of peer review

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. I feel the authors have adequately responded to all of my previous comments.



**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

## Elizabeth Saldo

### 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 authors did a good job taking their limited dataset and calculating movement and space use metrics. They also report separate statistics for male and female wild pigs.

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

I feel the volume of research on wild pigs in their introduced range does not match the magnitude of their adverse effects. Any research on wild pigs is valuable, and providing a dataset that can be accessed by researchers and managers alike can help move forward our understanding of wild pigs.

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

Taking into account the scope of a 2-page article, I believe the study design and methods will be fit for publication once certain methods are clarified.

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

Other reviewers suggested additional analyses that I agree would improve the article, but I believe the analyses submitted are adequate for a 2-pager that accompanies a dataset. I do think the authors' interpretation could be expanded upon, as there is not much discussion about their wild pig movement and space use results.

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

The layout of the article should be improved as the results contain methods.

**Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?**

I do not.

**Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

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

No, I do not want to be listed 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?**

No criticism of responses

**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?**

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator

## Cameron Wilson

### 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?**

Interacting.

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

I know it is a research note and not a full manuscript but the findings are basic and the implications are poorly justified.

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

The core of their approach is sound but they need considerably more references to justify methods. Half of the results is in fact methods.

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

I would like to see more in the results. Again I know it is a research note, but the findings don't really provide meaningful data. As per my comments, the average step length is meaningless on its own. I think that it would be relatively easy to input step length by time of day - they have hourly data! This could simply be a chart so won't take up much space but provide considerably more detailed information.

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

Need to add more references and greater justification of their research in both the introduction and the discussion.

**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?**

This paper needs major revisions and another round of peer review

### 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?**

NA

**Based on your review, what should happen next?**

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

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

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator