

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_123489</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Economic Valuation of Ecosystem Services of Coastal Area of Kinondoni District, Tanzania</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Overall, the article provides methodology of the ES valuation on a local scale that can serve as scientific/mathematical basis for other such studies. The authors examined & calculated local/global economic value of ecosystem services and functions have been affected by LULC changes over a 30-year period. However, the study appears to be more of a temporal assessment rather than a spatial one. They must show in graphics or numbers on how land use and land cover changes (LULCC) have progressed overtime for the study to be a spatial assessment. Also, discussion section is severely lacking.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Should avoid using lakhs with the US\$ amount to make it consistent with the content. Use K (hundred thousand) or M (million) units. Delete field survey- no field survey method is described in the article. Otherwise- the abstract content looks good.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subtopics are rather long. Shortened subtitles may be appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Strong point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computational methodology using ecosystem service value coefficients (VC)</li> </ul> <p>Major Weak points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must include a number of studies from Africa as well as other parts of the world to compare support or contradict the findings of this study and validate the outcomes.</li> <li>• A combination of figures and tables will benefit the content</li> <li>• Provide a few limitations of the study. How do you recommend overcoming those limitations?</li> <li>• Provide future directions for other scientist attempting to conduct this type of study.</li> <li>• Figures and tables are inadequately captioned.</li> <li>• There are articles in the references section not included in the text.</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include discussion passage and a number of citations appropriate for the discussion narrative. For example.  <a href="#">Ecosystem services valuation in China: A meta-analysis</a> N Kang, <a href="#">L Hou</a>, J Huang, H Liu - Science of the Total Environment, 2022 - Elsevier</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the language good, well written and the content clear. Below are a few minor comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstract: Using \$ and lakh together is vague. Use the 100K ( thousand) or M (million) units for clarity and</li> <li>• Figure 1. The Map origin/date is not clear, please specify. Also, indicate different land categories (mangrove, bare, water, built areas....) and a date when the map was prepared.</li> <li>• Figure 2. Provide a brief yet comprehensive caption of the flow chart.</li> <li>• Table 1. Also add VC sources in the table caption or as a foot note.</li> <li>• Caption and information of all tables should be clear.</li> <li>• Add Discussion, Limitations, Future directions in the Results and discussions section. Remove some reputation to stay within the length of the content.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i></p> <p>None detected.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Saubhagya Silwal</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Salem College, USA</b></p>