

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_122622
Title of the Manuscript:	Role and Value of Ecosystem Services to Cultural Practices in Festival Celebration in Rural Communities of Northern Ghana
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>Cultural services of nature, especially of biodiversity, are not well explored yet. Only a few aspects such as sacred groves are well documented but intangible aspects, identity related aspects are not documented well. These are extremely important for understanding conservation related behaviours. This paper is important as it addresses these and documents indigenous practices and behaviours.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title sounds incomplete and not self explanatory. Perhaps a catchy short title with a longer subtitle can be tried. Or atleast some starting words such as Documentation of the role... or Assessment of the role....</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract is well written and detailed and definitely interests a reader to take a look at the main paper. But there need to be 1-2 sentences (before the methodology part) on why this research/project was undertaken. Aims/objectives of this specific research work or research questions posed.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Structure of the MS is fine and sections are appropriate. However, the sub-sections can be structured better and perhaps a table showing comparative uses to different communities in one region can be added if the data is collected from multiple places. It would help to clearly state each ecosystem service (within the sections) and mention if they are direct/indirect/tangible/intangible benefits etc. Authors can refer to TESSA toolkit which helps addresses various services separately.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>This MS can be made scientifically more accurate in many ways. Introduction can be reduced, aims and objectives can be clearly defined and results based on primary information can be more detailed, as authors have obviously studied the area in great details. All the wild species mentioned should have scientific names with authority when mentioned first in MS. Photos of FGD can be added if respondent permissions are available or with masked identity. Use of abiotic resources and biotic resources should be separated and wild and cultivated should be separated. A simple table can be added with more details of each in the text. Repetition in text should be avoided. Authors should think of a wider readership, which may not know the culture of the region and explains some basic social structures etc in the introduction/study area. Research design, methodology, rapport building research questions, sampling, survey periods, ethical aspects, permissions should be clearly described. As this is a trans-disciplinary study, authors should consult some basic textbooks on ethnobiology on how to frame this part.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The papers are more on livelihoods but a better review of work specifically on ecosystem services will be useful .</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There should be a thorough language check especially for grammar and sentence construction.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Its an interesting paper and will be quite useful to broad set of readership interested in human-nature interactions.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aparna Watve
Department, University & Country	India