

21-Jun-2022

Dear Dr Ramdani

Manuscript WF22066, entitled 'Shifting conflict into collaboration: Peatland fires' mitigation in the transition zone of biosphere conservation in Sumatra Indonesia', which you submitted to International Journal of Wildland Fire, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewers and of the Associate Editor who handled the paper are appended below (see also attached files).

On balance, the reviews were positive, but the manuscript requires major revision before it could be published. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the comments below and revise your manuscript.

Please note that a more focused and concise writing is requested, but also that we do allow the word limit to be exceeded, especially for social science studies where more space may be required. This may be needed to address some of the literature and methodological queries, however, there remains plenty of scope overall for being more concise.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to International Journal of Wildland Fire; I look forward to receiving your revision. Instructions on how to revise your manuscript are included at the end of this letter.

Sincerely,

Prof. Stefan H. Doerr  
Editor-in-Chief  
International Journal of Wildland Fire

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Dear Editor-in-Chief and Associate Editor**

We thank you and the reviewers for the valuable suggestions and insights. All the comments received were constructive and very helpful for improving our manuscript. Particularly, Reviewers 3 & 4 help us—special acknowledgement to them. We want to provide a point-by-point response to the comments provided by the reviewers. We have also sent the article to the proof-reader, ensuring our manuscript is clearly understandable.

### **Reviewer: 1**

Comments to the Author

1. Problem statements is ok
2. previous studies review is ok
3. Research method is ok
4. Findings: In the research method, the authors used Nvivo. However, I do not see any data analysis using Nvivo, etc. coding, crosstable analysis. Mostly data analysis are narrative not an analytic ones. It is hard to understand Collaborative-conflict transition: Uncertainty, interdependence, consequential incentives. How did conflict into collaboration from 2016 till 2019? This paper missed these points.

**Response:** Thank you for your appreciation and constructive comments.

We want to clarify that we use the NVivo 12 plus for the data classification instead of analysis. We coded every informant statement and information according to the framework in the node, but we did not do the crosstab analysis, for example, by cross-tabbing nodes and cases.

We have modified our explanation in the research method where we stated that the NVivo 12 plus was used mainly for the data classification. This part of data classification is aimed at: 1) identifying the issue of uncertainty and interdependence between conflicting parties, 2) exploring the consequential incentives expected in collaborative action, and 3) analyzing the roles of the convener, such as legitimation, facilitation, mandate, and persuasion, in the process of conflict resolution and collaborative action.

Lastly, we have modified the context of the conflict, conflict resolution, and collaborative action, where we add dates of events from 2016 to 2019. We hope that by adding dates, it can clearly show stage-by-stage processes of shifting conflict into collaborative action.

## Reviewer: 2

### Comments to the Author

-The paper is original and has a similarity index of less than 2%.

-The paper seeks to critically analyze what turning points had shifted this conflict to collaboration and what roles did the convener play in these collaborative-conflict transition processes. Although the idea of the study is well-intentioned, guiding and useful, it suffers from theoretical aspects. The authors propose collaborative activities which have important role on reducing the village's vulnerability to the peatland fires in a non-scientific methods, such as using discussion conversations of parties.

-Abstract should state concisely why the study was done, what hypothesis was tested, and how the study was undertaken; should give the principal findings and conclusions; and should highlight the implications for future research. Background, Aims, Methods, Key results, Conclusions, Implications should be summarized in paragraphs, not label by label in the abstract. This structure is not in a standard scientific form.

**Response:** Thank you for your constructive comments.

We have modified our abstract and followed the standard of scientific form as you can see in the current manuscript. For example, we began with the general background of conflict over natural resources and the issue in our case study, followed by the aim of the research, research methodology, findings, conclusion and implication. However, since we are working with qualitative research, we highlight research questions instead of the hypothesis.

-There has not been enough literature review to describe similar collaboration alternatives and success stories. Instead, the authors focused mostly on drivers of collaboration. Therefore, it is recommended that the authors explain in detail the national or international examples. Then, in the discussion section, these should be compared and novel aspects of the study should be revealed.

**Response:** We have added several examples of methods introduced in shifting conflicts into collaboration worldwide in the introduction. Then, we tried to state our research focus based on the research gap, which analyzed what turning points can turn conflict into collaborative action and what roles the convener plays in facilitating the collaborative-conflict transition processes.

-Discussion section was written such as continuation of introduction. Instead, the authors should compare pros and cons of this study according to literature that is considered.

**Response:** In the discussion, now, we compare our findings with the existing research. For example, on page 19, we compare our results with the USA, Nepal, and Finland case studies regarding how to shift the conflict into collaboration. On page 20, we compared the case of interdependence with the research by Chaudhary et al. (2015). **On page 21**, we also correspond with the case study in Rumania and Papua New Guinea.

-Do the results confirm the methods used by the authors? What are the points in this study that add novelty compared to other studies?

**Response:** We based the results on the methods utilized by the authors during the research, such as face-to-face interviews, participatory observation, document analysis, and GIS mapping. We presented all those data in the findings. For example, we make a direct citation from the informants

in terms of the interview data. We showed the distribution of canal blocks in the village based on GIS mapping and observation. We also put a figure of fire occurrence in the village based on the data analysis collected during the stay in the village.

In terms of novelty, this study contributes to the discussion on how to shift the conflict into collaboration. We can learn from our case study that through the facilitation of a convener, uncertainty, interdependence, and consequential incentives have driven the conflicting parties into collaboration. The collaborative activities have reduced the village's vulnerability to the peatland fires. Previous research has shown the failure of top-down collaborative arrangements in dealing with forest fires in Indonesia due to the inertia of bureaucracy where the power is centralized in the vertical government institutions (Purnomo et al. 2021). The evidence from our case study suggests that an informal collaboration from a non-state initiative has enabled the local institution in the peatland fire mitigation in Indonesia.

Some more improvements are as follows:

-The paper content should not exceed 5000 words, but includes around 8.000 words. It should be revised.

**Response:** We have revised the paper and tried to minimize the number of words. Currently, the number of words is 7094.

-Introduction section should include the motivation, objectives, and proposed study/solution.

**Response:** We have modified the last paragraph of the introduction where we mention the objectives study, which aims to analyze what turning points can shift conflict into collaborative action and what roles the convener plays in facilitating these collaborative-conflict transition processes. We also highlighted our argument as the proposal/ solution for mitigating the peatland fires, particularly in Indonesia.

-Page 5-Line 122;-Page 24-Line 573; Subjective pronoun shouldn't be used in a scientific study.

**Response:** On pages 5-Line 122; -24-Line 573, we have changed the subjective pronoun "we" into "study."

-In the discussion section, the results of this study and other similar studies in the literature should be clearly compared in a table.

**Response:** We did not use the table style to compare the findings of our study with other similar studies. Instead, we discuss them in detail in the discussion section.

-Literature studies older than 15 years should not be used as references as much as possible.

**Response:** Lastly, in the current/ updated manuscript, only one article was published before 2007. It is the article by Bryson, John M, and Barbara C Crosby. We keep this article since we use it to explain the importance of collaboration, and this article is well known/prominent citation in the academic literature.

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author

1. Please put objective of the study in the introduction part

**Response:** Thank you for your insightful comments. In the last paragraph of the introduction, we state the study objective that this study aims to analyze what turning points can shift conflict into collaborative action and what roles the convener plays in facilitating these collaborative-conflict transition processes.

2. Please use 'oil palm' instead of 'palm oil'

**Response:** We have changed all “palm oil” into “oil palm.”

3. Please describe the number of respondents

**Response:** In the research method, we have explained the number of respondents in total 35 key informants. We interviewed them in 2016, 2018, and 2020. Those key informants represent the conflicting parties, conveners, and other collaborative actors, such as villagers, PCC members, oil palm farmers, village officers, sub-district officers, timber company representatives, international donors, ENGOs' leaders, and IPRA. The number of those representatives is presented in Table 1.

4. Please make the conclusions concise, not too long nor putting references in it.

**Response:** We have worked on the conclusion to be more concise and removed the references.

*For detail comments and suggestions, please see the attachment!*

We have worked with the detailed comment you addressed in the manuscript.

Reviewer: 4

#### Comments to the Author

Congratulations, it's a good manuscript. I have inserted comments in the attached file as a suggestion for changes. Your manuscript will be more valued.

Special attention to citations, references, figures and tables (journal instructions).

**Response:** Thank you for your appreciation and insightful comments on the manuscript.

We have worked with all the detailed comments you addressed on the manuscript, for example, concerning the keywords, the use of present tense instead of future tense, and removing some unnecessary sentences or moving them to other sections.

In the method section, we also minimized the usage of “first author” as the subject and tried to synthesize the last paragraph about the GIS.

We have also put all full stops before the closing quotation mark since all those sentences are complete grammatical sentences.

We remove the repetitive words “for example” and the unnecessary references.

As you suggested, we changed the citation style from APA to American Political Science Association.

Finally, we have correctly followed the presentation of the figure, chart, and table based on the journal instructions. we have also made changes in the map.