

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

Daniel Pinillos¹

¹ Universidad Rafael Landívar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper touches upon a very interesting and relevant topic, i.e., “ecosystem service inequality.” It is an innovative phrasing and certainly an important issue to address. The author discusses this in the context of avocado production in Salamina, Colombia. The paper is well-written, and the author appears very knowledgeable about the area and the theory he applies. Nevertheless, the manuscript has serious flaws in terms of structure that make the paper very difficult to read. Moreover, there are final claims that do not appear to hold true, mainly because of the lack of clear structure and logic in the paper. I suggest the following:

1. The text under the “Introduction” title is extremely short; that is not what an introduction should be. While insightful, many things remain almost in the dark. For instance, what does the author mean by “ecosystem services inequality,” and how is this a “meta-reflection”? What ecosystem services are going to be discussed? There should be substantial differences if talking about regulating, supportive, or provisioning cultural ecosystem services; this is a crucial issue completely missed in the paper.
2. Most of the text in sections 2.1, 3.1.1-3.1.5 should belong to a more extensive introduction; as it is, the titles are completely uninformative (e.g., “Political Economy,” “Discourses”).
3. The paper should have a more conventional structure to make its reading easier: Methods, Results, and Discussion sections. As it is now, I simply did not get what is what. There is a mix of all these throughout the paper; for example:
 - a. The author mentions several concepts without even introducing them first, such as “critical institutional analysis.” The concepts of power1 and power2 are interesting and seem quite relevant for the analysis but definitely need more explanation; Figure 2 does not succeed in illustrating the concepts.
 - b. Table 1 appears to belong to a Method section as it describes the characteristics of the participants in the “Social Situation”; what is this social situation? It is not clear what is meant by that.
 - c. It is not clear where in the text or in the analysis the concepts described in Figure 1 are used regarding the different types of governance for ES.
 - d. Section 3.3 seems to be a “Results” section, which fails to show the outcome of the analysis by means of applying all the conceptual frameworks described at the beginning. The claim that “this process contributes to the perpetuation of the prevailing global corporate food..... (large scale plantations)” appears more as a personal opinion and not something revealed by the analysis. The same holds true for the final conclusion in which the

author claims that this paper “undeniably illustrates that the agrarian transformation driven byecosystem services.” The wording of the following claim also appears more as a personal opinion: “ It is my firm contention that the current.....inequalities.”

In sum, while the paper addresses a very interesting and a very important issue, namely ecosystem services inequality, the paper fails to convincingly show it, mostly because of its lack of structure, which prevents distinguishing a clear research question, methods to address that research question, and results to answer that research question, discuss it, and arrive at sound conclusions. I recommend that the author reorganize these major aspects first for further revisions prior to considering this paper for publication.