

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_122569
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Stakeholder Preferences and Willingness to Pay for Ecosystem Services in Kole Wetlands: Insights for Effective Conservation Planning
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	To Pass: Contains modern and interesting content, especially the environment and climate in the country's society.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	appropriate.	
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.	appropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	An analysis of the protection and restoration of wetlands for the conservation of cultural values should be added to align with the analysis in Table 1 and the conclusions at the end.	
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.	The information in the section on the source of the problem and the guidelines for solving it are consistent with the referenced research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	appropriate.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	appropriate.	
Optional/General comments	None	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jintana Unhavaithaya
Department, University & Country	Nakhon Phanom University, Thailand