

# Review of: "Ecosystem Services Inequality Driven by Agroextractivism in Salamina, Colombia: A Critical Institutional Analysis"

Girma Shumi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Comments to qeios and author

I read the manuscript carefully and found it an interesting work. However, it needs revision and rework to strengthen it for wider application, particularly for the maintenance of the elements of social-ecological system, and then, for resilience building in **Salamina, Colombia and other similar landscapes in Global South** My recommendation is supported by the following assessments and comments under each section/subsection, below.

### Title

The title "**Ecosystem Services Inequality Driven by Agroextractivism in Salamina, Colombia: A Critical Institutional Analysis**" seems attractive, but by only critical institutional analysis (that is by leaving the analysis of the actual beneficiaries of ecosystem services by age, gender, wealthy or social status aside), the author may not achieve the intended aim/s. If it still meant only for institutional analysis, then, I would suggest the title to be "**Ecosystem Services governance Inequality Driven by Agroextractivism in Salamina, Colombia: A Critical Institutional Analysis**."

### Abstract

In statement "By integrating frameworks of ecosystem services (ES) governance and the critical institutional analysis and development (CIAD), I offer insights into the emergence of ES inequality within the context of rapid agricultural landscape transformation and the constraints posed by agroextractivism, embodied by the expansion of Hass avocado plantations in Salamina, Colombia.", instead of "... rapid agricultural landscape transformation ...", I would prefer to say "... rapid agricultural landscape intensification or commodification ...".

From the statements "The findings reveal that the Hass avocado industry in Salamina has both deliberate and unintended outcomes. On one hand, it perpetuates the agro-capitalism model and aligns with the global corporate-food regime, driven by large-scale growers and increasing consumer demand for healthier food options. On the other hand, it inadvertently exacerbates inequality in the distribution of ecosystem services because of a governance system that lacks mechanisms for ensuring equitable access to them.":

a) As to me the findings reveal two main unintended outcomes, from social-ecological systems perspective of the study area. In this regard, I suggest the author to see, e.g., <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102467>;

<https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15932>; and <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0260-z>

b) The author should provide the implications of these findings for the sustainability of social-ecological systems, i.e., ecosystem services (long-term social wellbeing) and the biodiversity (ecological elements), of the area.

## 1. Introduction

As to me, the author and the paper could benefit, if the author could start the introduction by introducing “the current state of the art” or by “general problems” of ecosystem services governance and landscape commodification at global and local level, and then, continue with the frameworks, e.g., see: <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-14209-280234>

## 1. Ecosystem Services and Governance

Under this, it would be better if the author could cite Díaz et al., 2018:

<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aap8826>

and some other related works, e.g., in statements “However, this concept has faced discussions, criticisms, and counterarguments (Schröter et al. 2014). One major critique revolves around the definition of what ES truly is.” or elsewhere in this paragraph and bring in also about Nature’s contribution to people (NCP). Then, the author should clearly indicate why he/she focused on ecosystem services, or why not NCP?

In general, I am a bit confused whether this work is research (empirical) work or literature review! Specifically, if it is research work, I suggest the author to clearly present “the Ecosystem Services Governance framework (Primmer et al. 2015) and the new commons framework (Duraiappah et al. 2014)” under one heading “conceptual frameworks” in combination. Then, the “methods” to apply these conceptual frameworks or to achieve the aim/s of the study, “results”, “discussion” and “final thought or conclusion”. But as it is now, the manuscript is inflated with many and mixed concepts, and hence, difficult to follow or understand and replicate the work, particularly such problems exist in the manuscript parts from main section or heading “**Ecosystem Services and Governance**” to the end of “**3. Critical Institutional Analysis and Development (CIAD)**”, i.e., “**Outcomes and Evaluation**”. I also suggest the author to shorten these parts.

## 4. Final Thoughts

In the statement “Transformations like land-use changes, e.g., from livestock to Hass avocado, often supported by property rights and rural development policies, affect the maintenance of ES not at the regional or municipal scale, but at the village and property level.”, I prefer to change the term “Transformations”, here and elsewhere in the manuscript, see my comment above!

Here, I also suggest the author to clearly restate or present the main findings of the study, and then, discuss their implications for local social-ecological systems resilience and maintenance.

For conclusion and recommendation, see my comment above also.

