



**Paper: “InVEST-based assessment of carbon sequestration potentials and environmental dynamics in the coastal area of Lagos”**

**Submitted: 31 October 2024**

**Accepted: 21 January 2025**

**Published: 31 January 2025**

Corresponding Author: T.B. Adedoja

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n3p30

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nebnoma Romaric Tiendrebeogo  
Nazi Boni University, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Djadjiti Namla  
Nile University of Nigeria, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Paulin Ouoba  
Université Nazi BONI, Burkina Faso

-----  
Reviewer B:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is relevant, but could be adjusted slightly to directly reflect the results or approach used. For example, mention the use of the InVEST model.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is complete, but contains unnecessary repetition and could be simplified to give greater prominence to the main results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Although the text is generally well-written, a few minor grammatical and spelling errors remain, as well as overly complex sentences. Punctuation is also missing in some places, making the text difficult to read.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are detailed, but some explanations (notably on the InVEST model) deserve greater clarity and structure.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body is well structured, but the separation between results and discussion could be improved. The subsections sometimes lack fluidity. Also review statements without references, some references are misquoted in the text. Some references cited in the text do not appear in the list of references.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion is pertinent, but could be strengthened by including more concrete recommendations and future prospects.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list is exhaustive but could be improved by separating the results and discussion sections.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- Simplify the abstract and avoid repetitions.
- For introduction: 1.Reorganize paragraphs to establish a logical link: global problem → importance of coastal ecosystems → case of Lagos. 2. Clarify the research gap to which the study responds. 3. Add reference for each affirmation
- Review the citation of certain references in the text.
- Add punctuation
- Review the clarity of the explanations about the InVEST model in the methods section.
- Clearly separate the results from the discussion.
- Add practical recommendations and perspectives in the conclusion.
- Ensure consistency between in-text citations and the listed references.

-----  
-----  
Reviewer D:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is okay.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is overly wordy with some grammatical errors, and the language has to be reviewed. Ideally 200-250 words should be perfect.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

A thorough proofreading is necessary because there are several grammatical errors and inconsistencies throughout the paper, which have to be addressed.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are clear but lack structured subsections for clarity purpose.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The authors need to make a clearer statement of the research objectives in the introduction part. For the results and discussion part, emphasis should have been on the implications of the findings. Finally, there should be more descriptive captions to provide sufficient context about the figures and tables.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

In their conclusion, the authors should have provided a critical evaluation of the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research. Also, they should have emphasized on the practical implications of the findings for policy and land management in Lagos.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references is incomplete. There are several formatting issues. Some references lack DOIs, and there are instances of incorrect capitalization in the titles. Additionally, the reference to the IPCC guidelines is cited as "IPPC" instead of "IPCC," which requires correction. Finally, some of the works cited in the main text are not included in the list of references.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----  
-----  
Reviewer E:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes the title is clear

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Very few errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes very clear and comprehensive.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Very few errors (see the text)

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references is comprehensive

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3



**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----