

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript brings the potential for future collaboration among the different stakeholders to ensure the sustainability of Kole Wetland and provide different perspective on the conservation as each has their own concern and needs. The findings open for different fields to contribute and benefit; promoting multidisciplinary in research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	'Evaluating Stakeholder Preferences and Willingness to Pay for Ecosystem Services in Kole Wetlands' is enough.	
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.	The justification for the stakeholders' willingness was not mentioned. It would add clarity if mentioned briefly in the abstract. Punctuation needs to be amended: 'Estimated mean annual WTP was Rs.211,indicating ...' Suggestion to revise the aim of the study in the abstract so that it gives clarity and reflection of the title; the identification of various ecosystems services was not part of the title.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The arrangement of the subsections seems appropriate. However, overall structure feels dull without any figures. Some significant information can be illustrated in figure form to help the reader to understand better.	
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.	More details of the respondents would add more value to the depth of the data collection; such as the number of ricer farmers. Some part of the discussion can be discussed, as written in General Comment, but the original writing has already showcase excellent exploration on the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Overall good. Reference number 12 missing year publication.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Introduction: WTP should be part of the first or at least second paragraph instead being in the last to tie the whole narration as one. A few relevant images of the wetland would help to gain the reader's interest as the study area was mentioned.</p> <p>2. 1 Study Area: Providing images would help readers to visualise the setting of Kole Wetlands. Spacing 'The Kole wetlands are a part of Vembanad-Kole RAMSAR site and was ...'. Please define 'panchayaths'.</p> <p>2.2 Study design and data collection: A framework of the study would b. Spacing 'As a second step, ...' and Scopus should be spelled as a proper noun. Briefly describe what unique means in '... 6 more unique peer reviewed articles were collected.' How many stakeholders are in total? Spacing 'during May and June months of the year 2024.'</p> <p>3.1 Ecosystem Services from Kole Wetlands: Instead defining the general definition of the types of Ecosystem Services, why not discuss on the result; why does Regulating Services has more number than Cultural Ecosystem Services?</p> <p>3.4 Willingness to pay (WTP) for Kole land conservation: The result from 3.3 on the priority for conservation was the least for recreational, should be continually discussed in 3.4 since highest WTP was found. It is a contrasting result and would be meaningful if the correlation between the two results was discussed further.</p> <p>3.5 Determinants of Willingness to Pay (WTP): Based on 'Increased awareness leads to a greater understanding of the ecological value of the wetlands and the benefits of conservation. Educated stakeholders recognize the importance of preserving the ecosystem and are thus more likely to contribute financially to support conservation initiatives.', what is the takeaway from the statement? The takeaway can be the final sentence of the subsection.</p> <p>4. Conclusion: State which professionals can benefit.</p> <p>Kindly ensure all spacing in the manuscript are consistent and the use of proper noun are appropriate (e.g., Scopus, Table 1, Table 2, suggestion: Kole Wetlands).</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Rohana Binti Mohd Firdaus</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universiti Teknologi, Malaysia</p>