

Peer Review: A path towards the conservation and recovery of Guloninae species worldwide

Joanna M. Bugar^{1,2*} , Scott Yaeger^{1*} , Erika Anderson³ , Scott Brainerd⁴ , Nathan Chabaud⁵ , Stacy R. Cotey⁶ , Elizabeth Croose⁷ , Jason T. Fisher⁸ , Ingebjorg J. Hansen¹ , Paul Hapeman⁹ , Tim R. Hofmeester¹⁰ , Betsy L. Howell¹¹, Jamie Kingscott¹² , Jenny MacPherson¹³ , Emiliano Manzo¹⁴ , Vladimir G. Monakhov¹⁵ , Claire Poirson¹⁶ , Aleksey Y. Oleynikov¹⁷ , Eleanor R. Scopes¹⁸ , Hayley Smith¹⁹ , & Wayne D. Spencer²⁰ 

Accepted by 4 of 5 reviewers

Funding Information

The authors were supported by their respective institutions while writing this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publishing History

Submitted 15 June 2024
Accepted 27 March 2025
Published 14 August 2025

Corresponding Author

Joanna Bugar
jobugar@gmail.com



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons

Collaborators: Katie Moriarty + 4 other reviewers

¹ Ministry of Water, Land and Resource Stewardship, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

² Department of Natural Resource Sciences, Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, British Columbia, Canada

³ Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA

⁴ Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Koppang, Norway

⁵ Institut de Recherche sur Les Forêts, Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Rouyn-Noranda, Québec, Canada

⁶ College of Forest Resources and Environmental Science, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan, USA

⁷ British Small Animal Veterinary Association, Woodrow House, Waterwells Business Park, Quedgeley, UK

⁸ School of Environmental Studies, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

⁹ Department of Biology, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, Connecticut, USA

¹⁰ Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Environmental Studies, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Umeå, Sweden

¹¹ Olympic National Forest, United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Washington, USA

¹² Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust, Coleford, England, UK; Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Somerset, England, UK

¹³ Vincent Wildlife Trust, Ledbury, Herefordshire, UK

¹⁴ Fondazione Ethoikos, Convento dell'Osservanza S.N.C., Radicondoli, Siena, Italy



¹⁵ Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Plant and Animal Ecology, Yekaterinburg, Russia

¹⁶ Coordination Mammalogique du Nord de la France, Vimy, France

¹⁷ Institute of Zoology, Almaty, Kazakhstan

¹⁸ Forest Research, Alice Holt Research Station, Farnham, UK

¹⁹ WSP UK Limited, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

²⁰ Conservation Biology Institute, Corvallis, Oregon, USA

*equal co-first authors

Transparent Peer Review

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

Recommended Citation

Burgar, J. M., Yaeger, S., Anderson, E., Brainerd, S., Chabaud, N., Cotey, S. R., Croose, E., Fisher, J. T., Hansen, I. J., Hapeman, P., Hofmeester, T. R., Howell, B. L., Kingscott, J., MacPherson, J., Manzo, E., Monakhov, V. G., Poirson, C., Oleynikov, A. Y., Scopes, E. R., Smith, H., & Spencer, W. D. (2025). A path towards the conservation and recovery of Guloninae species worldwide. *Stacks Journal*: 25007. <https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-25007>



Reviewer Summaries

Taal Levi

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?

This was a nice review of the taxonomic group with systematically obtained input from people at the Martes conference

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

It's a nice synthesis of current thinking about the major threats and conservation actions with respect to this taxonomic group.

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

None

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

None

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

No

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?

Revise & Resubmit

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?

Excellent responsiveness to reviewer 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?

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



Marie Martin

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?

I commend the authors on a substantial revision to this manuscript. I found the flow and tone of the manuscript to be intuitive and enjoyable to read, and they provided a lot of great information and synthesis regarding the status and ecology of Guloninae. They also effectively summarized their survey results, which can be difficult to do with social science/qualitative data.

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

By providing a succinct review and synthesis of Guloninae research, ecology, and conservation, and sharing the values/perceptions of Guloninae researchers to guide future conservation and (possibly) collaboration efforts

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

I think it would be helpful to more clearly link the review/synthesis and survey with the discussion/"conservation wins". Further, to a few of the other reviewers' points, it's unclear whether there was (or needed to be?) some IRB approval for the survey, or how the authors structured and identified survey questions and goals

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

There was little qualitative analysis, and it would be helpful to break down sample sizes, potential biases, and where and when certain regions and species were underrepresented in the authors' research

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

There are a handful of line edits and suggested citations I added but most probably reflect personal preference over objective improvement

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?

Revise and resubmit

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?



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

Katie Moriarty

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?

I liked the diverse approach of summarizing data and attempting to provide context towards a greater goal. The purpose of the paper, to focus on a broader path for conservation, is a worthy endeavor

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

If the author(s) make time to re-envision the results and discussion in a way that allows for broader context and using the data to inform future endeavors, then this paper could provide an example of using a group of experts to create an actionable plan for broader implications.

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

The study design was ok but certainly leaves a great deal to be desired in terms of randomization and larger extrapolation. Not only is this an observational study, but the results are limited to a non-random selection of observers. Meanwhile, I think the methods could use a bit of technical writing and organization to provide readers with context. Clarity and organization first in the methods, then to the results and discussion will help with the paper's professional outcomes

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

Here, I would focus on making the data more interpretable - perhaps by displaying proportions instead of counts - and then interpret the data. There's a narrative mismatch between the actions and the dialogue in the results. Another specific addition that could be interesting, if the data allow, is to separate achievements/wins and threats by species similar to the introduction

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

It would be great to spend more time in the discussion to align the results and expand using other resources/papers or examples to provide context

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?

Accept

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?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?



Nothing specific.

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?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

Jenna Parker

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 synthesizing information on single species, and are approaching something useful for conservation of Guloninae species.

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

As is, I do not think the portions presented in methods and results are useful, but if the review parts are expanded and the paper becomes a literature review with author synthesis and recommendations based on the successes or failures of specific conservation action outcomes, it would become extremely useful to conservation practitioners.

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

The authors do not do any analyses. If this paper is to be kept in the same general format where the survey/voting/discussions are presented as methods, qualitative analysis needs to be employed, and we need more information on participant breakdown (e.g. by species, location, etc.) and how discussion groups were determined.

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 need a qualitative analysis so we know their findings are not biased.

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

Yes, the paper needs a lot of work to become useful, as noted in my comments.

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?

Reject

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?

3/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?



It is not that the authors did not respond to my feedback - they introduced a qualitative analysis, which I appreciated. But as the authors noted, that analysis brought bias into conclusions that are already very general - too general (in my opinion) to be of use. The threats to species are well-known; we know that habitat preservation is the number one route to saving species. All species could also benefit from greater monitoring. I think the survey data was good because it got a group of experts talking about recovery efforts and next steps. However, I think those next steps, e.g., coming up with a recovery plan, need to be completed before attempting a more comprehensive publication. Yes, conservation biology is a crisis discipline, and it is good to have all of the information we can about species, but that information should be useful, or it presents an extra publication to wade through when quick decisions need to be made. Having said this, I love the graphical abstract and the species distribution figure; I wish I knew how to make such beautiful figures! I also love the mini-review of what is known concerning the conservation of each species - that is a wonderfully helpful aspect. I stand by the idea that this paper could be turned into a broader review worthy of publication. It could also be a paper where the Guloninae experts who attended the working group collaborate to make a piece where more specific threats, management concerns, and proposed actions are laid out for each species. Trying to analyze this general survey for all of Guloninae ends up restating what we already know about the needs of biodiversity. I wish I could be more positive - again, there are excellent aspects of the paper! However, I feel the attempt at analyzing the survey and discussion results needs to be dropped, and right now, that is where the paper is most intensively focused.

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper needs major revisions and another round of peer review

What do the authors need to change for you to accept this article for publication?

An attempt at analyzing the survey data needs to be dropped as the conclusions that come out of it are too general to be useful. I think a broader review, or replacing the survey portion with pieces from the experts on each species with specific recommendation towards supporting that species' well-being, would be excellent.

Phoebe Parker-Shames

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 presented a creative approach to identifying conservation wins, threats, and actions for Guloninae species. I thought they did a good job capturing and synthesizing expert knowledge, and it is exciting to read that there are already actionable outcomes from the project.

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

The concept of different types of colonization (neighborhood vs. random) is still fairly novel and will be applicable for many wildlife monitoring studies

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



I think this research is a useful synthesis of Guloninae conservation that could help guide future research or management efforts. I also think it demonstrates a methodology that would be broadly applicable to conservation researchers or others who want to take advantage of the opportunity symposia provide to bring experts together.

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 need to include information on their IRB review process, and add a little more additional information on how they actually conducted their methods so that it would be reproducible. They could improve some of their analyses and figures by using the strength of their qualitative data rather than solely trying to fit qualitative information into a quantitative framework.

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

Another careful read-through to tighten up the wording/clarity would help with readability.

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

I didn't see any information listed for IRB review for human subjects research, which would be needed because they use survey and non-anonymous focus group data collection methods.

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

Revise and resubmit

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?

Overall, they genuinely seemed to have considered and responded to all the feedback. They didn't take all of my suggestions, but there was a fair amount of reviewer disagreement, so I think it's fair that they didn't do everything I recommended. It is very clear that this is their first social methods paper, so some of what they are doing isn't really best practice, including the ways in which they are seeking to quantitatively represent findings, particularly for the online results. Hopefully next time they pull in someone with a little more experience with these type of analyses, and go through the IRB process. Considering the paper is by and for a very specific community, I think it achieves its goals.

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