

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129057
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ECOSYSTEM SERVICES OF COASTAL LANDSCAPES AND ITS SOCIETAL IMPACTS IN SELECTED AREA OF ILAJE, ONDO STATE.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it sheds light on the factors affecting ecosystem services in coastal landscapes, specifically in Ilaje, Ondo State, Nigeria. It provides insights into the societal impacts of these changes, a critical area for sustainable development and environmental policy. The use of statistical tools such as Spearman's correlation and ordinal regression adds scientific robustness to the study. Additionally, it identifies actionable recommendations for policymakers, which is essential for addressing ecosystem degradation globally.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, for conciseness, consider modifying it to: <i>"Factors Influencing Coastal Ecosystem Services and Societal Impacts in Ilaje, Ondo State, Nigeria."</i>	
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 abstract effectively outlines the study's background, aim, methods, results, and conclusion. However, it could be improved by briefly including key recommendations from the study to enhance its practical relevance. Please refrain from using the same keywords that have been used in the title. Use different words to enhance the retrievability of your work.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound, employing appropriate methodologies and statistical analyses. However, further clarification of some statistical results, particularly the practical implications of certain findings, would improve its scientific rigor. 2. While the manuscript provides a robust analysis of the factors influencing ecosystem services, the statistical methodology requires more detailed descriptions to ensure replicability. Specifically, it is unclear whether the data were examined for normal distribution before choosing the statistical methods. For instance, it is not stated if normality tests such as Shapiro-Wilk or Kolmogorov-Smirnov were applied to assess the suitability of parametric methods like Pearson's correlation. Instead, Spearman's correlation was used, which is appropriate for non-parametric or ordinal data. 3. The rationale for selecting Spearman over Pearson should be clarified. Were the data determined to be non-parametric based on statistical testing, or was the decision made based on assumptions about the data? Providing this clarification and including details on the normality testing process would strengthen the methodological transparency and allow others to replicate the analysis confidently. 4. The manuscript does not mention whether respondents were asked if they understood the concept of ecosystem services. Given the focus on ecosystem services and their societal impacts, it would be valuable to assess the respondents' baseline knowledge of this concept. Including such information would add depth to the study and help interpret the validity of the responses regarding ecosystem services in the surveyed communities. 5. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and relevant. However, some references are outdated (e.g., sources from the early 2000s). Adding more recent studies (2018–2023) on coastal ecosystem services and societal impacts would strengthen the literature review.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is understandable but requires significant grammatical improvement for scholarly communication. Sentences are sometimes repetitive, and the use of terminology could be more concise and precise.	
Optional/General comments	Include visual aids such as charts or graphs summarizing key findings to enhance readability. Avoid redundancy in the discussion section; streamline by focusing on the unique contributions of the study. The manuscript is valuable and scientifically robust, but minor revisions are needed to improve language quality, update references, and enhance the clarity of certain sections	

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	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania