

WILDLIFE CORRIDOR PROTECTION AND HUMAN-ANIMAL CONFLICT

Prof. Raman Sukumar

Honorary Professor

Centre for Ecological Sciences

Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Wildlife corridors are landscape linkages that enable animals to move between habitat areas for feeding, breeding, dispersal, seasonal migration, and adaptation to environmental change. Their protection has become increasingly important where forests, grasslands, wetlands, and river systems are divided by farms, settlements, roads, railways, mines, fences, and other forms of land conversion. At the same time, corridors frequently overlap with working landscapes and settlements, creating conditions in which wildlife movement can lead to crop damage, livestock depredation, property loss, injury, fear, and retaliatory killing. Effective corridor protection must therefore address both ecological connectivity and the safety, livelihoods, and rights of people living in shared landscapes.

This study uses a qualitative, literature-based approach to examine the relationship between wildlife corridor protection and human-animal conflict. It reviews ecological connectivity principles, habitat-fragmentation research, linear-infrastructure mitigation, coexistence frameworks, conflict-prevention measures, community participation, and land-use governance. The analysis follows a corridor-management sequence: identifying habitat linkages, assessing movement risks, securing and restoring habitat, reducing dangerous encounters, responding to losses, monitoring outcomes, and revising management through local participation. Particular attention is given to the need for prevention measures that are species-specific, place-based, socially legitimate, and supported by credible institutions.

The study finds that corridors can strengthen biodiversity conservation only when their design and governance are integrated with conflict prevention and coexistence planning. Land-use zoning, wildlife crossings, habitat restoration, early-warning systems, livestock protection, crop-risk reduction, rapid response, fair compensation, and community-led monitoring can work together to reduce risk. However, no single measure is universally effective. Sustainable outcomes depend on reliable evidence, local knowledge, transparent decision-making, long-term funding, and equitable sharing of the costs and benefits of living with wildlife. The paper concludes that corridors should be treated as social-ecological systems rather than as isolated strips of habitat.

Keywords: Wildlife Corridors, Ecological Connectivity, Human-Wildlife Conflict, Coexistence, Habitat Fragmentation, Landscape Planning, Community Participation, Wildlife Crossings, Conservation Governance, Risk Reduction

1. INTRODUCTION

Wildlife populations depend on movement across landscapes. Animals travel to obtain food and water, locate breeding partners, maintain genetic exchange, respond to seasonal change, and shift away from disturbance. When natural habitats are broken into isolated patches, these movements become more difficult and risky. Habitat fragmentation can reduce population persistence, restrict dispersal, increase edge effects, and expose animals to roads, fences, settlements, and other hazards. Ecological connectivity refers to the unimpeded movement of species and the flow of natural

processes that sustain life, while wildlife corridors are one important element of a broader ecological network designed to maintain or restore such connectivity [1, 8, 10].

A wildlife corridor may include forest belts, riparian strips, ridgelines, grassland passages, stepping-stone habitats, seasonal routes, or permeable agricultural and community landscapes. It does not need to be a single narrow strip of land. In many regions, animal movement depends on a mosaic of protected areas, private land, community-managed forests, farms, water sources, and infrastructure crossings. Protecting this

connected landscape is especially important for wide-ranging mammals, migratory ungulates, elephants, large carnivores, amphibians, and species whose ranges need to shift under climate pressure. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) recommends that connectivity be planned as a network involving protected areas, other effective area-based conservation measures, and compatible land uses beyond formal reserves [1].

The same spaces that support wildlife movement may also support agriculture, grazing, transport, tourism, housing, and local livelihoods. As animals move through shared landscapes, people may experience crop raiding, livestock losses, damage to stored food or property, road collisions, threats to safety, and restrictions on daily movement. These impacts are commonly described as human-wildlife conflict, although the term can conceal the diversity of relationships, values, institutions, and historical conditions shaping encounters between people and animals. Human-animal conflict is not simply an ecological problem. It is also a question of risk, inequality, livelihood security, land rights, public trust, and the distribution of conservation costs [2, 3, 21].

Corridor protection can either reduce or intensify conflict depending on how it is planned. A protected linkage that avoids villages, secures seasonal water, reduces road mortality, and includes effective local safeguards can reduce dangerous encounters. In contrast, a corridor identified only on a map, without community consultation or support for affected households, may transfer risk to people who receive little benefit from conservation. This paper investigates corridor protection through a coexistence perspective. It reviews the main ecological and social challenges, compares corridor contexts, and proposes an integrated framework for safeguarding movement while reducing avoidable harm to people and wildlife.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Connectivity science has developed in response to the ecological consequences of fragmented landscapes. Research has shown that isolated habitat patches can limit movement and create long-term risks for biodiversity, particularly where species require

large home ranges or multiple habitat types. Conservation corridors are intended to improve functional connectivity: not merely the physical arrangement of habitat, but the extent to which organisms can actually move through it. Scientific approaches to corridor identification include field tracking, camera trapping, occupancy analysis, genetic evidence, resistance modelling, circuit theory, expert knowledge, and local observations of animal movement [8, 9, 11, 13, 14].

The literature also emphasizes that corridor effectiveness is context dependent. A linkage that appears suitable in a land-cover map may be unsuitable if it is blocked by traffic, night lighting, fencing, human activity, invasive vegetation, or conflict-related persecution. Linear infrastructure has become a major concern because highways, railways, canals, pipelines, and transmission lines can create barriers and direct mortality. Wildlife crossings, fencing designed to guide animals safely, speed management, warning systems, and careful routing can reduce some impacts, but their effectiveness requires monitoring, maintenance, and integration with surrounding habitat [4, 15, 16].

Human-wildlife conflict research has moved beyond an exclusive focus on technical deterrents. Earlier approaches often emphasized damage control after an incident. More recent work recognizes that coexistence requires prevention, participatory decision-making, reliable institutions, social legitimacy, and attention to the uneven burden carried by rural and marginalized communities. Reviews of human-carnivore and human-herbivore interactions show that interventions are more likely to be durable when they are tailored to local species behaviour, livelihood practices, cultural contexts, and people's perceptions of fairness [3, 19, 20, 22-26].

2.1 CONCEPT AND SCOPE OF WILDLIFE CORRIDORS

- Wildlife corridors are ecological linkages that connect habitat areas and enable movement, dispersal, migration, gene flow, and access to seasonal resources.
- Corridors may include continuous habitat, stepping-stone patches, riverine routes, forest edges, grassland passages, underpasses, overpasses, and compatible working landscapes.

- A corridor differs from a protected area because its central purpose is to maintain connectivity between ecological areas; it may cross multiple ownerships and land-use categories.
- Functional connectivity depends on animal behaviour, habitat quality, disturbance, barriers, mortality risk, and the willingness of people and institutions to maintain compatible land uses.

2.2 HUMAN-ANIMAL CONFLICT IN CORRIDOR LANDSCAPES

- Crop damage, livestock depredation, property loss, traffic collisions, injuries, and fear can occur where movement routes overlap with farms, settlements, roads, and grazing areas.
- Conflict impacts are often distributed unevenly: households located near forest edges, water points, or seasonal routes may bear a disproportionate share of risk.
- Retaliatory killing, habitat conversion, unplanned fencing, and exclusionary governance can further undermine connectivity and intensify conservation conflict.
- Livelihood security, rapid response, compensation or insurance, access to information, and respectful participation influence whether communities perceive corridor conservation as legitimate.

2.3 CONNECTIVITY AND COEXISTENCE FRAMEWORKS

- The IUCN connectivity guidelines provide a framework for maintaining, enhancing, and restoring ecological connectivity through networks and corridors [1].
- The IUCN SSC human-wildlife conflict guidelines emphasize prevention, response, monitoring, institutional capacity, and equitable coexistence rather than reliance on isolated deterrents [3].
- The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework recognizes the

importance of well-connected conservation systems and the inclusion of rights-holders and local communities in biodiversity action [5].

- Monitoring should combine ecological indicators, such as movement and mortality, with social indicators, such as damage experience, response time, trust, participation, and perceived fairness.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study examines wildlife corridors as social-ecological systems in which animal movement, habitat protection, infrastructure planning, and human livelihoods are closely connected. The object of study is not a single corridor or species. Instead, it considers representative corridor landscapes where conservation objectives must be balanced with the prevention of harmful human-animal encounters. The analysis focuses on how corridors are identified, secured, restored, managed, monitored, and governed over time. The theoretical basis of the study is grounded in the principle that connectivity and coexistence should be addressed together. A corridor that enables movement but creates unmanaged risks for people is unlikely to retain long-term social support. Similarly, a conflict programme that ignores habitat connectivity may reduce short-term incidents while contributing to isolation of wildlife populations. The study therefore treats ecological integrity, public safety, livelihood protection, procedural fairness, and adaptive governance as linked requirements of successful corridor protection.

3.1 CORRIDOR LANDSCAPES AND COEXISTENCE REQUIREMENTS

The study considers five representative corridor contexts. These contexts illustrate that the ecological function of a linkage, the type of human-animal interaction, and the appropriate prevention measures differ across landscapes.

Table 1. Corridor contexts, protection needs, and coexistence considerations

S. No.	Corridor Landscape	Protection Requirement	Main Human-Animal Risk	Coexistence Value
1	Forest-agriculture mosaic	Secure forest patches, resting cover, and seasonal routes; maintain compatible farm edges	Crop damage, livestock loss, night-time encounters	Supports movement while creating opportunities for crop protection, early warning, and

				community stewardship
2	Road and railway crossing zone	Use wildlife underpasses or overpasses, guidance fencing, crossing signage, and speed management	Vehicle collisions, injury, barrier effects, and emergency response risks	Reduces mortality and maintains movement across transport corridors
3	Riverine and water-access route	Protect riparian vegetation, water sources, and safe approach zones; avoid blocking seasonal access	Competition at water points, crop raiding near rivers, dangerous encounters	Maintains seasonal movement and can reduce pressure on settlement water sources
4	Peri-urban habitat edge	Manage light, waste, dogs, fencing, and land conversion; retain stepping-stone habitat	Property damage, waste attraction, road mortality, public fear	Enables risk-aware planning before settlement expansion closes movement routes
5	Transboundary or community- managed landscape	Coordinate land use, habitat restoration, local rights, benefit sharing, and cross- jurisdiction monitoring	Unequal costs, enforcement disputes, retaliatory killing, loss of trust	Builds durable connectivity through collective governance and shared responsibility

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the ecological role of wildlife corridors in maintaining movement, dispersal, and landscape connectivity.
- To identify the principal forms of human-animal conflict associated with corridor landscapes and shared resource use.
- To compare protection and coexistence requirements across forest-agriculture mosaics, infrastructure crossings, riverine routes, peri-urban edges, and community-managed landscapes.
- To evaluate the importance of land-use planning, mitigation measures, compensation or insurance, local participation, and institutional trust in corridor governance.
- To develop a practical framework for corridor protection that supports biodiversity conservation while reducing avoidable risks to people and wildlife.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative and literature-based research methodology. It synthesizes conservation guidelines, ecological-connectivity research, infrastructure-mitigation literature, and scholarship on human-wildlife conflict and coexistence. The approach is

appropriate because the central research question concerns the relationship among landscape structure, wildlife movement, human livelihoods, and governance rather than the measurement of a single numerical outcome. The study does not present primary field-survey data; its findings are interpretive and intended to provide a structured framework for planning and further empirical research.

The methodological framework follows a corridor-protection lifecycle. It considers the identification of movement routes, assessment of ecological and social risks, protection or restoration of habitat, management of roads and other barriers, deployment of prevention measures, rapid response to incidents, monitoring of outcomes, and periodic review. This lifecycle approach recognizes that corridor protection is not completed by legal notification or mapping alone. It must be maintained through day-to-day land-use decisions and relationships among agencies, communities, landholders, researchers, and civil-society organizations.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN (QUALITATIVE ANALYTICAL APPROACH)

- The study follows a qualitative and comparative design based on established conservation literature, international guidance, and documented field-practice principles.
- The analysis compares corridor settings according to habitat structure, species movement requirements, infrastructure pressures, livelihood exposure, and governance conditions.
- The study uses a social-ecological perspective that links movement ecology with risk reduction, institutional legitimacy, and community participation.
- Findings are interpreted through planning and management principles rather than through a controlled experiment or a statistically representative survey dataset.

4.2 CORRIDOR PROTECTION AND COEXISTENCE FRAMEWORK

- Connectivity assessment is structured around core habitats, movement routes, stepping-stone areas, barriers, mortality hotspots, and future land-use change.
- Conflict assessment considers crop and livestock exposure, travel routes, water use, waste management, seasonal patterns, household vulnerability, and perceived risk.
- Mitigation options include habitat restoration, zoning, wildlife crossings, traffic management, early warning, crop protection, livestock husbandry, rapid response, and compensation or insurance mechanisms.
- Governance is assessed through clear roles, accessible reporting systems, response capacity, transparent decision-making, local representation, and long-term financing.

4.3 LANDSCAPE AND COMMUNITY CONTEXT

- The study considers forested linkages, agricultural mosaics, riparian routes, transport corridors, peri-urban edges, and cross-boundary movement landscapes.
- Wildlife is treated as a diverse group that may include elephants, large carnivores, deer, primates, ungulates, and smaller species; management should remain species- and site-specific.
- Human communities are considered in relation to farming, grazing, forest-

resource use, travel, schooling, livelihood assets, cultural values, and access to state support.

- Institutions are considered through their authority for land use, wildlife management, road planning, disaster response, compensation, law enforcement, and local development.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

The following ecological, social, and governance parameters are evaluated:

- Continuity, quality, and seasonal usability of habitat links, including barriers and mortality risks.
- Evidence of wildlife movement, including field signs, camera records, telemetry, local knowledge, and genetic or occupancy information where available.
- Frequency, timing, location, and severity of crop loss, livestock depredation, property damage, collisions, injury risk, and retaliatory action.
- Accessibility, reliability, and perceived fairness of prevention support, rapid response, verification, compensation, and grievance mechanisms.
- Extent of community participation, representation of affected groups, land-tenure clarity, and coordination among conservation, infrastructure, and development agencies.
- Capacity for adaptive management through monitoring, transparent reporting, maintenance, and periodic revision of corridor and coexistence plans.

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review ecological-connectivity guidelines, corridor science, and human-wildlife conflict literature.
- Identify recurring ecological and social pressures in shared landscapes and corridor settings.
- Compare representative corridor contexts according to movement needs, barriers, conflict pathways, and governance requirements.
- Map each context to protection, mitigation, response, and participation measures.
- Interpret the combined evidence to formulate an integrated corridor-protection and coexistence framework.

- Develop practical recommendations that can guide site-specific planning, monitoring, and future empirical investigation.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Qualitative comparison of corridor functions and human-animal interaction risks across representative landscape contexts.
- Interpretation of how ecological measures and livelihood safeguards can be combined to produce socially legitimate conservation outcomes.
- Assessment of the relationship between land-use governance, institutional trust, mitigation effectiveness, and long-term habitat connectivity.
- Identification of interventions that can be adapted for protected-area boundaries, multi-use landscapes, infrastructure projects, and community-managed areas.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis indicates that wildlife corridor protection cannot be separated from the social conditions of the surrounding landscape. In ecological terms, a corridor must support movement at the scale and time required by the species concerned. This requires more than visual continuity of vegetation. Animals may avoid a route because of traffic, fencing, lighting, noise, intensive human activity, lack of cover, or previous persecution. Conversely, a narrow but secure and well-managed linkage can be highly valuable where it connects core habitats and avoids severe barriers. Corridor assessment should therefore combine spatial modelling with on-the-ground validation, species knowledge, and observations from local residents who encounter wildlife movement regularly [1, 11, 13, 14].

The analysis also shows that the risks faced by people are shaped by spatial and seasonal patterns. Crop loss may be concentrated during harvest periods, while livestock depredation may increase where animals graze unattended near cover or water. Road collisions may occur at predictable crossing points, and dangerous encounters may be associated with night-time travel, waste disposal, or access to water and forest resources. This means that prevention should not be designed as a generic package. Measures should target the specific pathways

that produce harm. For example, an underpass can address transport-related mortality, while a grain-storage improvement, carefully located solar fencing, herd supervision, or an early-warning system may be more relevant in an agricultural corridor setting.

A further finding is that compensation alone rarely resolves human-animal conflict. Compensation can reduce the financial burden of verified losses, but it may be delayed, inaccessible, insufficient, or perceived as unfair. Research on coexistence suggests that prevention, timely response, respectful communication, and transparent procedures are just as important as payment. Households are more likely to cooperate with corridor measures when they can report incidents easily, understand the decision process, receive practical prevention support, and participate in decisions about local land use and mitigation priorities [2, 3, 21, 24].

The comparative assessment highlights the importance of institutional coordination. Corridors commonly cross legal boundaries and sectors: wildlife agencies may manage protected areas, road agencies control transport infrastructure, local governments influence land-use permissions, and communities manage farms, grazing land, or customary forests. When these institutions work separately, a corridor can be undermined by an approval, fence, road upgrade, settlement expansion, or land-use change outside the jurisdiction of a single conservation authority. Integrated planning should therefore recognize corridor routes in local and regional land-use plans, require connectivity safeguards in infrastructure decisions, and create clear responsibility for monitoring and response.

The analysis does not support a single universal mitigation formula. Evidence reviews have found that claims about effectiveness are often stronger than the available evaluation data, especially for measures intended to reduce livestock predation. This makes monitoring essential. Interventions should be tested against a baseline, documented carefully, evaluated for both ecological and social outcomes, and revised when they do not reduce risk. Measures that reduce harm to one group while shifting the burden to another should be reconsidered. Effective coexistence is not the

absence of all incidents; it is a durable condition in which risks are reduced to tolerable levels, losses are addressed fairly, and wildlife populations can persist within shared landscapes [23, 25, 26].

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that corridors are essential conservation tools in landscapes where protected areas alone are insufficient to maintain viable wildlife populations. They support movement between habitat areas, provide routes around fragmented land uses, and may help species respond to changing climate and resource conditions. Yet corridor maps can create a false sense of security if they are not translated into legal recognition, management actions, and compatible land use. A line on a plan does not guarantee that animals can cross safely, that habitat will remain available, or that communities will receive support when wildlife movement affects their livelihoods.

A coexistence approach changes the question from how to keep wildlife and people completely separate to how to reduce avoidable harm while retaining ecological function. Complete separation is not feasible in many rural, forest-edge, riverine, and peri-urban landscapes. Nor is it necessarily desirable where local communities hold ecological knowledge, cultural relationships, or conservation interests linked to wildlife. The goal is not to romanticize risk. It is to recognize that safety and livelihood protection are necessary conditions for conservation legitimacy. Corridor plans should therefore include human safety protocols, local communication systems, risk-sensitive infrastructure, and household-level prevention support from the earliest planning stage.

The strongest corridor strategies are layered. At the landscape scale, they protect core habitat, restore degraded links, prevent incompatible development, and maintain movement across roads and railways. At the community scale, they support safer crop and livestock practices, early warning, rapid response, accessible claims processes, and representation of affected households. At the institutional scale, they create coordination across agencies, stable funding, shared monitoring, and transparent feedback mechanisms. At the knowledge scale, they

combine scientific data with local observations while documenting uncertainty and avoiding assumptions that every conflict report has the same cause or solution.

Equity is central to this approach. Conservation benefits such as biodiversity protection, ecosystem services, tourism, and national heritage may be enjoyed broadly, while the direct costs of wildlife movement can be borne by a relatively small number of households. Ethical and practical corridor governance requires that these households are not treated merely as obstacles to conservation. They should be recognized as rights-holders, partners, and holders of place-based knowledge. Benefit sharing, secure land tenure, voluntary conservation incentives, livelihood diversification, insurance or compensation, and meaningful decision-making can help address unequal burdens, but they must be adapted to local conditions rather than imposed through standard models.

Finally, corridor protection should be adaptive. Land use, wildlife movement, climate conditions, infrastructure, and community needs change over time. Corridor plans need periodic review through ecological monitoring and social assessment. Indicators should include evidence of wildlife use, mortality and barrier effects, incident patterns, response time, mitigation maintenance, household experience, and confidence in institutions. This integrated evidence can reveal whether a corridor is functioning not only as a route for animals but also as a durable agreement for sharing space.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined wildlife corridor protection and human-animal conflict as interconnected dimensions of landscape conservation. It showed that ecological connectivity is necessary for the movement, persistence, and adaptability of many wildlife populations, but that movement routes often overlap with farms, settlements, roads, and other livelihood spaces. Corridor protection must therefore be planned as a social-ecological responsibility. It must protect habitat and movement while also reducing risk, supporting livelihoods, and ensuring that the people most affected by wildlife encounters have a meaningful role in decision-making.

The analysis found that forest-agriculture mosaics, infrastructure crossings, riverine routes, peri-urban edges, and transboundary or community-managed landscapes require different combinations of conservation and coexistence measures. Habitat restoration, land-use zoning, wildlife crossings, traffic management, early-warning systems, safer crop and livestock practices, rapid response, transparent compensation or insurance, and community-led monitoring can contribute to better outcomes when they are coordinated. No measure is sufficient in isolation, and

effectiveness should be verified through monitoring rather than assumed.

Wildlife corridors can support biodiversity, ecological resilience, and shared landscape stewardship when their governance is fair, evidence-based, and adaptive. Their long-term value depends on maintaining the relationship between habitat, movement, public safety, livelihood security, and institutional trust. When corridor protection is integrated with coexistence planning from the start, it can reduce avoidable conflict and help create landscapes in which both people and wildlife have a more secure future.

8. REFERENCES

1. Hilty, J., Worboys, G. L., Keeley, A., Woodley, S., Lausche, B. J., Locke, H., Carr, M., Pulsford, I., Pittock, J., White, J. W., Theobald, D. M., Levine, J., Reuling, M., Watson, J. E. M., Ament, R., and Tabor, G. M. (2020). *Guidelines for Conserving Connectivity through Ecological Networks and Corridors*. IUCN WCPA Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 30. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
2. United Nations Environment Programme and World Wildlife Fund. (2021). *A Future for All: The Need for Human-Wildlife Coexistence*. Nairobi: UNEP.
3. IUCN Species Survival Commission. (2023). *IUCN SSC Guidelines on Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
4. Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. (2022). *Guidelines for Addressing the Impact of Linear Infrastructure on Migratory Species*. Bonn: CMS.
5. Convention on Biological Diversity. (2022). *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. Decision 15/4. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
6. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2019). *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Bonn: IPBES Secretariat.
7. UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. (2024). *Protected Planet Report 2024*. Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC and IUCN.
8. Beier, P., and Noss, R. F. (1998). Do habitat corridors provide connectivity? *Conservation Biology*, 12(6), 1241-1252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.1998.98036.x>
9. Crooks, K. R., and Sanjayan, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Connectivity Conservation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Fahrig, L. (2003). Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 34, 487-515. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.34.011802.132419>
11. Haddad, N. M., Brudvig, L. A., Clobert, J., Davies, K. F., Gonzalez, A., Holt, R. D., Lovejoy, T. E., Sexton, J. O., Austin, M. P., Collins, C. D., Cook, W. M., Damschen, E. I., Ewers, R. M., Foster, B. L., Jenkins, C. N., King, A. J., Laurance, W. F., Levey, D. J., Margules, C. R., Melbourne, B. A., Nicholls, A. O., Orrock, J. L., Song, D.-X., and Townshend, J. R. (2015). Habitat fragmentation and its lasting impact on Earth's ecosystems. *Science Advances*, 1(2), e1500052. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1500052>
12. Hilty, J. A., Lidicker, W. Z., and Merenlender, A. M. (2019). *Corridor Ecology: The Science and Practice of Linking Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation (2nd ed.)*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
13. McRae, B. H., Dickson, B. G., Keitt, T. H., and Shah, V. B. (2008). Using circuit theory to model connectivity in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *Ecology*, 89(10), 2712-2724. <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-1861.1>

14. Zeller, K. A., McGarigal, K., and Whiteley, A. R. (2012). Estimating landscape resistance to movement: A review. *Landscape Ecology*, 27, 777-797. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-012-9737-0>
15. Clevenger, A. P., and Huijser, M. P. (2011). *Wildlife Crossing Structure Handbook: Design and Evaluation in North America*. Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
16. van der Ree, R., Smith, D. J., and Grilo, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of Road Ecology*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
17. Newmark, W. D. (1996). Insularization of Tanzanian parks and the local extinction of large mammals. *Conservation Biology*, 10(6), 1549-1556. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1996.10061549.x>
18. LaPoint, S., Gallery, P., Wikelski, M., and Kays, R. (2013). Animal behavior, cost-based corridor models, and real corridors. *Landscape Ecology*, 28, 1615-1630. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-013-9910-0>
19. Treves, A., and Karanth, K. U. (2003). Human-carnivore conflict and perspectives on carnivore management worldwide. *Conservation Biology*, 17(6), 1491-1499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2003.00059.x>
20. Dickman, A. J. (2010). Complexities of conflict: The importance of considering social factors for effectively resolving human-wildlife conflict. *Animal Conservation*, 13(5), 458-466. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2010.00368.x>
21. Nyhus, P. J. (2016). Human-wildlife conflict and coexistence. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 41, 143-171. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085634>
22. Inskip, C., and Zimmermann, A. (2009). Human-felid conflict: A review of patterns and priorities worldwide. *Oryx*, 43(1), 18-34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003060530899030X>
23. Redpath, S. M., Bhatia, S., and Young, J. (2015). Tilting at wildlife: Reconsidering human-wildlife conflict. *Oryx*, 49(2), 222-225. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605314000799>
24. Pooley, S., Barua, M., Beintart, W., Dickman, A., Holmes, G., Lorimer, J., Loveridge, A. J., Macdonald, D. W., Marvin, G., Redpath, S., Sillero-Zubiri, C., Zimmermann, A., and Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2017). An interdisciplinary review of current and future approaches to improving human-predator relations. *Conservation Biology*, 31(3), 513-523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12859>
25. Carter, N. H., and Linnell, J. D. C. (2016). Co-adaptation is key to coexisting with large carnivores. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 31(8), 575-578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.05.006>
26. Eklund, A., Lopez-Bao, J. V., Tourani, M., Chapron, G., and Frank, J. (2017). Limited evidence on the effectiveness of interventions to reduce livestock predation by large carnivores. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 2097. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-02323-w>
27. Woodroffe, R., Thirgood, S., and Rabinowitz, A. (Eds.). (2005). *People and Wildlife: Conflict or Coexistence?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. Madden, F. (2004). Creating coexistence between humans and wildlife: Global perspectives on local efforts to address human-wildlife conflict. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 9(4), 247-257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871200490505675>
29. Distefano, E. (2005). *Human-Wildlife Conflict Worldwide: Collection of Case Studies, Analysis of Management Strategies and Good Practices*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
30. Linnell, J. D. C., and Cretois, B. (2018). *Research for AGRI Committee - The Revival of Wolves and Other Large Predators and Its Impact on Farmers and Their Livelihood in Rural Regions of Europe*. Brussels: European Parliament.