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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript provides valuable empirical insight into the application of the RAWES (Rapid Assessment of Wetland Ecosystem Services) approach in assessing the ecosystem services of urban wetlands. The study contributes to urban ecology by identifying both beneficial and degraded ecosystem services in a rapidly urbanizing landscape. These findings are significant for informing urban planning, conservation strategies, and participatory wetland management, particularly in developing country contexts where wetland degradation is often underreported | This research paper provides insight into the application of the Rapid Assessment of Wetland Ecosystem Services (RAWES) approach in accessing the ecosystem services of urban wetlands. The study contributes to urban ecology by both beneficial ecosystem services and degraded ecosystem services in urban wetlands. The findings of this paper are significant for urban planning, conservation strategies and wetland management especially in urban areas. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is suitable and effectively reflects the content and scope of the research. | Yes, the title of this research paper is suitable for research. |
| 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 is generally comprehensive, summarizing the objective, methods, results, and implications. However, it would benefit from the inclusion of a brief mention of the Ecosystem Services Index (ESI) results, as it is a central outcome of the study. Additionally, clearly stating the timeframe (year 2025) in the abstract can enhance clarity. | Yes the abstract of this paper is suitable. I do not want to add something to the abstract. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound and methodologically valid. The study design, data collection using the RAWES framework, and analysis of ecosystem service contributions through the ESI approach are appropriate and well executed. The ecological interpretation and classification of services align with current international frameworks such as the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. | Yes, the research paper is scientifically correct and the methodology used is valid. The data collection for this paper was done using RAWES framework and analysis of ecosystem service contributions by ESI approach are valid. The ecological interpretation and classification of services is described in MEA. |
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript is generally well written. Minor grammatical corrections and sentence restructuring are recommended in the introduction and conclusion to improve flow and clarity. The use of technical terms is appropriate, and the scientific narrative is coherent. | The language used in this paper is English and is suitable for scholarly communications. |
| Optional/General comments | The study addresses an urgent and underrepresented area of research. The integration of ecological and cultural values in wetland assessment is commendable. Visuals such as Graphs 1–3 support the findings effectively. However, the discussion could be further enriched by comparing the findings with other urban wetland assessments in different global contexts. | The study addresses the significant area of research. However, cultural ecosystem services showed significant positive contributions. |
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