

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

Ricardo Gellert Paris¹

¹ Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article and the case are very interesting, and it's important to bring to academic dispute this topic. The positionality, although not expressed, is clear, which I think is good and engaging. The theoretical framework is nicely done.

I think there are some points that could be improved or further explored.

One general recommendation is, when building a discourse on social categories and identities, to try to avoid generalizations. It's more helpful and interesting (although much harder) to understand internal contradictions and differentiations than to fit in plain identities.

The appendix table is confusing, and I think it'd be helpful to have a map, at least to localize the landscape in dispute.

Below are some comments on specific pieces.

Section 2.1 – It's not really clear which of the specific governance modes are institutionalized, which ones are formal, which ones were established by the author as an external expert, etc.

Maybe, by stating this *"Governing ES at such scales requires greater coordination efforts (bridging institutions) because the other modes of governance do not govern the way actors experience everyday life in the field and the way allocation-distributions interplay"*, the author might be sub-estimating the ways the superstructure conditions everyday experiences. Even though the article's focus is on the micro-scale, once stating the multiple dimensions of governance, it is somehow expected that the acknowledgement of the vertical influence would be made, or at least to explain why it does not impact the local dynamics.

3.1.4 - The topic on discourses is very interesting, especially when referring to the reinforcement due to certification. It could be further explored. Do the current companies have certifications?

However, the first paragraph, when presenting a more general critique on capitalist ideology, although essential to be done, could be presented in a less generic perspective. Do these ideas are in fact reproduced by the local actors? Where can we see the productivism discourse being reproduced by government entities? Do the farmers reject or incorporate it, building their subjectivity?

Section 3.2.1, in the sentence *'Salamina's traditional coffee-centric landscape has undergone rapid transformation in response to global dietary trends and strategic policies. This shift towards agro-capitalism and specialization, exemplified by the emergence of Hass avocado plantations,...'* seems a bit confusing. Once a coffee-centric landscape might already be an agro-capitalist and specialized system, if not, it could be interesting to state why (which conditions made the previous system non-capitalist? The land regime, the mode of production, etc.). It's a bit clarified 4 paragraphs below with the sentence *'...a departure from traditional production systems led by local peasants and cattle ranchers...'*, however, coffee is still a commodity driven by external demand.

This following sentence is very important. I know it's hard, but it would be great to be backed by data *Interestingly, the local consumption of Hass avocados is minimal, but their cultivation has had significant repercussions for the prices of essential commodities like meat and milk.'*

The final paragraph of this section. The sentence *'This transformation has resulted in elevated sediment levels in water bodies, leading to regulatory penalties and public complaints against corporations...'* could be backed by specific data or a citation to the court decree, for example.

Section 3.2.2 has some of the statements a bit generic. Nevertheless, they are key for the understanding of the case. It's not clear if they are observations of how the case is being developed, projections of the author, or concrete statements from the population (for example, when citing the loss of intangible benefits).

Section 3.2.3. In the first sentence, it's not clear to me how the preservation of the scenic beauty plays a role in sustaining the plantations.

The table is good for the understanding of the case.

'Hidden information regarding the environmental consequences of extensive plantations, especially those focused on Hass avocados, often remains concealed.' In this sentence, information is a key word, and it's not clear to what this concept is referring. Who holds or generates information? Is it environmental assessments? Do the companies need to have one to be approved by the gov.? Is there a third party generating information?

In general, the article is nice. I'd suggest to avoid generic statements and, when possible, back them with data (either quali or quanti).