

## **Appendix 2.** Review phase 1 -Web of Science search criteria

We were interested in scientific articles or reviews published in English in the research areas of “Environmental Sciences & Ecology” or “Biodiversity Conservation” that included keywords reflecting multiple approaches to social-ecological (also called human-environment or human-nature) research.

The following criteria were thus used to search papers potentially fitting our four pre-defined criteria:

- ts= ("soci\*-ecological" or "human-environment" or "human-\* conflict" or "human-\* interaction\*" or "soci\*-environmental" or “SES” or “social-biophysical”) AND
- ts = (ecosystem\* or ecological or biophysical or biodiversity or fisher\* or agricultur\* or forestry) AND
- ts=(framework\* or tool\* or model\* or applied or "decision-support system" or method\*) AND
- su = ("Environmental Sciences & Ecology" or "Biodiversity & Conservation")) AND
- LANGUAGE: (English)
- Refined by: DOCUMENT TYPES: ( ARTICLE OR REVIEW )

### *Summary of papers excluded during abstract review (Phase 1)*

At the search date (18<sup>th</sup> November 2015), searching Web of Science with the set of criteria defined in (B) resulted in 1760 papers. Taking into account those criteria, after reading their abstracts (done by AG and AN), the following amount of papers were excluded (i.e. not moved to following phase) because:

- 109 (6.2%) papers were not environmental related;
- 306 (17.4%) papers described general environmental issues (e.g. PES);
- 118 (6.7%) papers were reviews.
- 442 (25.1%) papers had mainly social focus (e.g. focused on attitudes or governance issues without ecological factors);
- 85 (4.8%) papers had mainly ecological focus (e.g. focused on animal abundance without social factors).

These papers were excluded from further analysis. Because some of the abstracts did not provide enough information to adequately establish if all of the above criteria were met, some screening questions were included in the next phase of the review (Phase 2 – see Appendix 3).

A subset of all relevant studies (n=120) was selected for the review because of the logistical constraints faced by the author team, and because the focus of the study was on broad patterns and trends rather than capturing specific details of individual studies.