

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAERI_122560 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Payment for Ecosystem Services' Implementation and Community Livelihood Improvement in Nyamwamba sub-catchment, Kasese District, Uganda |
| 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> |
|---|--|---|
| <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>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it addresses the implementation of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) in the specific context of the Nyamwamba sub-catchment in Uganda. By focusing on the impact of PES on community livelihood improvement, the study contributes valuable insights into how environmental policies can be effectively tailored to benefit both ecological conservation and local communities in a developing country context. I appreciate the manuscript's thorough approach to examining the socio-economic impacts of PES, as it offers practical implications for policy-makers and researchers interested in sustainable development and environmental economics. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion on the limitations and potential biases in the data collection and analysis.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title of the article, "Payment for Ecosystem Services' Implementation and Community Livelihood Improvement in Nyamwamba sub-catchment Kasese District Uganda," is suitable as it clearly reflects the main focus of the study—examining the impact of PES on community livelihoods in a specific region of Uganda. However, it could be slightly refined for clarity and conciseness. Suggested Alternative Title: "Implementing Payments for Ecosystem Services and Its Impact on Community Livelihoods: A Case Study of Nyamwamba Sub-catchment, Uganda."</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>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved for greater clarity and impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the Objectives: The abstract should clearly state the specific objectives or research questions the study aims to address. While it mentions the focus on PES and community livelihoods, specifying the research questions could make the abstract more precise. • Highlight the Key Findings: The abstract touches on the findings, but it could be more specific. Mentioning the most significant results, such as the strength of the relationship between PES implementation and livelihood improvement, would make the abstract more informative. • Consider the Length: If the abstract is too lengthy, it might be beneficial to streamline some points to ensure it remains concise while still conveying the essential aspects of the research. | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The structure of the paper is clear, covering essential aspects such as the introduction, methodology, results, and discussions. However, the introduction could be improved by clarifying some key terms and concepts right from the beginning to facilitate the reader's understanding. Additionally, a summary of the main findings at the end of the introduction would be helpful in guiding the reader.</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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The methodology is well-defined, combining qualitative and quantitative methods. However, it would be useful to provide a more detailed explanation of why this methodology was chosen and how the validity and reliability of the collected data were ensured. For example, in the sampling section, the rationale behind the number of participants and the process of their selection should be clarified. 2. In the statistical analysis, when performing regressions, it is essential to correctly understand the R and P values, as they provide important information about the relationships between variables and the statistical significance of the results obtained. 3. Terminologia utilizată este specifică domeniului PES și problemelor de mediu, ceea ce sugerează o bună înțelegere a subiectului. 4. The discussions are well-grounded in the data, and the conclusions are reasonable and well-argued. However, a more extensive discussion of the study's limitations would be useful, as well as ways in which these limitations could be addressed in future research. 5. The citation of figures in the text is incorrect: Figure 4 is not explained in the text. In section 3.1, Figure 6 is mentioned as "source of livelihood," but the figure does not exist. Place the figures | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | immediately next to their citations. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Incorrect citations both in the references and in the text. Check the references and their correspondence with the citations in the text. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language used is technical and appropriate for an academic context, but there are sections that could be clarified to avoid ambiguities. Additionally, grammatical and stylistic checking is needed in some passages to improve the text's flow. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

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: | Angelica Dobre |
| Department, University & Country | Romania |