

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JGEESI_121972</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessing The Forest Provisioning Ecosystem Services And Use In Forest-Savanna Ecological Zone</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<b>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.</b>	<b>Manuscript is important for a scientific community particularly to environmental engineers, forest policy promulgators', forest resource allocators and decision makers. I liked the manuscript because it emphasises the peculiar benefits of each species of ecosystem service provider. I disliked about the data collection approach being simple questionnaire rather than other technological approaches.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>MY SUGGESTION: ASSESSMENT OF SPECIES-BASED ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND ITS USEFULNESS IN FOREST OF SAVANNA ECOLOGICAL ZONE</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>Abstract is comprehensive except for the fact that I didn't clearly find the mentioning of how community forest with weak policies supplies less than 40% of resources and those with strong policies secured 40-80% of supply. My suggestion is: Mention clearly about the policy and how exactly it affected the supply.</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>I think there's no problem with subsections and structure of the manuscript.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>There's no issue with correctness and robustness of the manuscript. First reasons it that it delves into the distinctness of the species and their equivalent ecosystem service value, which is useful to the future researchers and scientific community. Secondly, paper talks about future prospects of palm products and its value to the industry and potential employment creation to the villagers.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>References are recent but not sufficient. Here are my suggestions:</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
Forest type and contribution to Ecosystem value in Table 5	Graphical representation of your findings about forest type and its contribution ecosystem using maybe pie-chart, or bar-graph etc. would give readers ability to quickly understand and compare the information.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anirudra Prasad Koirala</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kathmandu University, Nepal</b>