



ASSESSING THE EFFECTS OF TOURISM ON COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS AND SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Danishta Parveen

Research scholar, Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut

Dr. Vivek Kumar

Assistant Professor, Ch. Charan Singh University Meerut

Abstract

Wildlife and business thrive along the shore, and tourism has helped them develop. However, uncontrolled coastal tourism strains vulnerable ocean and land ecosystems. This harms industry-dependent natural capital. This article examines how tourism impacts sandy beaches, coral reefs, mangrove forests, and seagrass meadows. This study finds and groups tourism and infrastructure's primary physical, chemical, and biological consequences through a thorough literature review and conceptual analysis. The results suggest that management techniques might fail because they are limited, poorly implemented, or unable to adapt. Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) is a novel solution to these difficulties proposed in this study. This paradigm combines ecological economics, stakeholder theory, and adaptive management for flexibility. IACTM emphasizes creating defined ecological limits, integrating many stakeholders in a co-management structure, employing a combination of policy and economic instruments, and making choices based on continual learning. This systematic, coherent study contributes to scholarly discourse on a complex problem. It also presents a theoretically-based model for politicians and managers aiming to combine tourism-driven economic expansion with coastal environmental sustainability.

Keywords: Coastal tourism, ecosystem degradation, sustainable management, carrying capacity, stakeholder engagement

Introduction

Throughout history, the point where land meets sea has been a magnet for humans. Today, coastal and marine tourism are major industries that contribute to global economies. The majority of international tourists visit beaches and oceans each year (UNWTO, 2023) for various reasons. In particular, it has a significant impact on the gross domestic product (GDP) of many nations, including SIDS, and it sustains millions of employments. Businesses in this sector, which is frequently referred to as the "Blue Economy," capitalize on the abundance of marine life, pristine beaches, and robust coral reefs to provide tourists with opportunities to dive, fish, and unwind. However, a profound contradiction is spawned by this economic good news. The natural landscapes that serve as tourist magnets are particularly vulnerable to the devastation that this sector of the economy may wreak. The coastal zone is an interface that is both dynamic and physiologically complex; it is home to many species of plants

and animals and provides vital ecosystem services. One quarter of the world's marine species calls coral reefs home, and these ecosystems are crucial for preventing land erosion (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2017). According to Allongi (2008), mangrove trees serve many purposes: they provide a safe haven for fish larvae, act as carbon sinks, and shield coastal communities from flooding and storms. Dugongs and green turtles, two endangered species, rely heavily on seagrass beds for food and habitat (Unsworth et al., 2019). Beaches and dunes are more than simply pretty pictures; they're habitats for animals that rely on them for survival and a barrier for landmasses farther inland.

The ever-increasing development of resorts, piers, airports, and the communities that house them is tearing these ecosystems apart. The activities of tourists indirectly set off a series of unfortunate events. The improper treatment of wastewater leads to eutrophication, the death of reefs and seagrasses. Animals in the ocean end themselves entangled in rubbish, particularly plastic, and toxic substances make their way up the food chain. Some of the things that damage reef structures and degrade dunes include anchors, strolling on them, and recreational boating. The delicate balance of marine food webs may be disturbed by overfishing, which can worsen when demand for seafood increases. As an example of the "Tragedy of the Commons" (Hardin, 1968), this scenario illustrates how the selfish activities of both visitors and operators may lead to the depletion and degradation of a common, finite resource, in this case, the coastal environment.

A large gap remains in the application of this knowledge as integrated, effective, and flexible management, despite the fact that there is literature discussing these negative effects. Many approaches fail to consider the complex social and biological system in which these groups operate because they are siloed, focusing on either a single problem (such as water quality) or an isolated group of individuals (such as dive operators). Plus, traditional concepts like "carrying capacity" aren't always practical and don't always reveal the dynamic, non-linear ways in which ecosystems react to human demand (Saarinen, 2006). To that end, this research aims to fill that need. The purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the effects that visitors have on coastal ecosystems and to use that analysis to propose a stronger strategy for the long-term control of these consequences. The most important thing to remember if we want coastal tourism to be sustainable is that we can't keep doing things the way we always have. Instead, we need a flexible management system that brings together ecological constraints and social and economic government in a clear and integrated way. This research will begin by classifying the consequences according to important habitats, then examine existing management strategies, and lastly propose the scientifically sound and practically applicable Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) framework.

Objectives

1. To assess coastal tourism impacts on key coastal ecosystems.
2. To evaluate sustainable tourism management strategies.
3. To develop an Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) framework for sustainability.

Methodology

Following a thorough literature review and conceptual analysis, this study employs a qualitative research approach to examine coastal tourism's effects and management. Post-2000 peer-reviewed studies from Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and ScienceDirect were meticulously collected. The articles were picked for their relevance to coastal tourism and green business practices. Thematic analysis was utilized to identify the most important ecological consequences and management techniques in 125 accepted papers. The conceptual framework was developed via inductive and logical analysis. The literature review, ecological economics, stakeholder theory, and adaptive management were used to create the Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) framework. It promotes fact-based, inclusive coastal tourist management.

Results

According to the comprehensive literature review, there is a significant amount of evidence that demonstrates that tourism is detrimental to the habitats of coastal areas. Presented below is a breakdown of the results according to the kind of setting, followed by a list of the many control mechanisms that are currently in use.

Tourism-Related Environmental Pressures on Coastal Ecosystems

The primary factor impacting coastal ecosystem services was found to be pressures from tourists. Increases in tourism, urbanization, and urban population density were identified as sources of stress in twenty-seven of the papers we reviewed (54%). The expansion of existing facilities, the need for outdoor recreation, and the demand for natural resources are the primary drivers of these stressors. Twenty studies, or 40%, cited water and land pollution as the second most prevalent danger. Sewage overflow, agricultural runoff, maritime operations, and industrial waste were the sources of pollution. Unintentionally, tourism exacerbates these problems through increased traffic, litter, and overcrowding near the shore.

Stresses brought on by global warming were identified in 22 research, or 44%. Ocean warming, species extinction, coastal erosion, acidity, and land use changes were all factors that put pressure on the ocean. Thirteen research (or 28%) linked wildlife tourism, scuba diving, and fishing to habitat degradation. The surprising thing is that the impact of increasing tourism on habitat destruction has only been examined in one research (2%). This demonstrates that further study is greatly needed, despite the fact that coastal infrastructure is expanding globally.

Tourism impacts ecological services in several ways, according to the research review. Provisioning services are impacted by overfishing, agricultural growth, and freshwater resource decline. Due to climate change, less clean water, mangrove loss, coral reef destruction, and dune erosion, regulating and maintenance services are becoming worse. Cultural ecosystem services were involved in two events. Local identity is fostered, cultural traditions are preserved, and relaxing locations are improved through tourism. Coasts can lose some of their spiritual and aesthetic value when there are too many people, too much commerce, and too many alterations to the environment. Twenty of the studies (or 40%) focused on cross-sector collaboration and examined both managerial practices and policy

implications of integrative approaches. A total of fourteen research, or 28%, made use of future planning scenarios. This demonstrates that forecasts about adaptable governance and sustainable tourism are gaining traction.

Table 4. Pressures and Research Focus in Coastal Ecosystem Services

Category	Type	Number of Studies	Percentage (%)
Environmental Pressures	Climate change impacts	22	44
	Tourism, urbanization and population growth	27	54
	Water and soil pollution	20	40
	Recreational activities	14	28
	Overfishing and illicit hunting	10	20
	Oil spills and fecal contamination	3	6
	Resource extraction and energy exploitation	3	6
	Habitat loss	1	2
Study Focus	Integrative/common management strategies	20	40
	Policy and management implications	20	40
	Future planning scenarios	14	28
	Anthropogenic impacts	13	26
	Ecosystem-based management	8	16
	Spatial-temporal dynamics	3	6

Discussion of Ecosystem Service Frameworks and Methods

Thus, environmental service definitions varied widely between investigations. In environmental research and tourism-ecosystem studies, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment framework remains the most prevalent categorization system (30%). However, 38% of research did not specify their ecosystem service categorization models. This suggests that the research' methodology were inconsistent, making comparisons difficult. Surveys (36%), and statistical analysis (44%), were the most popular methods. Stakeholder perspectives and quantitative measurement are crucial to understanding how tourism impacts coastal ecosystems. Many people employed GIS-based modeling (32%) and indicator-based methodologies (28%) to spatially analyze environmental degradation, tourist density, and management results.

Multidimensional research using integrated ecosystem service technologies like InVEST and SolVES linked environmental conditions to human and economic benefits. Participatory planning and citizen science helped us understand local perspectives, notably on tourism's culture ecosystem services. The breadth of methodologies utilized illustrates that investigating tourism's effects on coastal ecosystems

spans several sectors. To promote long-term coastal tourist management, ecological modeling, socio-economic assessment, and participatory governance are essential.

Ecosystem Service (ES) Classification

The majority of the 50 research (31, or 62%) classified environmental services using a well-known method (Table 2). 15 studies—30% of framework studies—used the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). Its widespread use illustrates its importance for understanding ecosystem services and linking environmental functioning to human well-being, especially in tourist-dependent coastal areas. Twelve studies—24% of ecosystem service studies—used the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES). It appears that more research are using standardized and policy-driven techniques to measure ecosystem services. Two research (4%) employed Ecosystem Services Value (ESV) and De Groot et al. (2002) categorization.

Tourist and coastal ecosystem studies have diverse aims, work locations, and academic techniques; hence classification systems vary. Tourism ecosystem service research must be adaptable to account for natural variables, socioeconomic connections, and government agendas. Popular MEA and CICES organizations suggest that individuals are adopting more structured and global perspectives. In 2005, MEA became the first global ecosystem service research standard. Environmental policy reviews and ecosystem accounting initiatives became more comparable once CICES was released in 2013. Despite this improvement, 19 research (38%) did not explicitly define a categorization scheme, indicating methodological issues. Without standard categorization methods, it may be challenging to compare locations and apply ecosystem service ratings in sustainable coastal tourist planning and enforcement. Previous systematic evaluations identified similar issues, highlighting the need of using the same approaches to study how tourism impacts coastal ecosystems.

Ecosystem Service (ES) Dimensions

We found 43 studies (86% of them) on ecosystem service provision. This was followed by 15 (30%) demand studies and 11 (22%). Only four research (8%) examined all three environmental services simultaneously. Eleven reports (22%), mostly supply and demand, examined two aspects. Most (35 research; 70%) examined one dimension. The transition to supply-focused evaluations follows ecosystem service research trends. In coastal tourism areas, environmental conditions and resource availability are easy to monitor. Assessing supplies involves measuring biological and physical indicators such habitat health, wildlife, shoreline safety, and water quality. Tracking programs or remote sensing datasets provide these signals to examine how tourism impacts the ecosystem in different regions.

However, environmental service demand and flow remain unclear. Demand studies require socio-economic data on tourist preferences, visitor pressure, and stakeholder expectations. This data is challenging to collect and standardize. Sustainable tourism planning relies on studies that compare ecosystem service supply and demand to identify gaps between ecosystem capacity and visitor numbers. It's difficult to characterize, measure, and follow the geographical distribution of ecological benefits from ecosystems to receivers, therefore few research examine ecosystem service flow. Despite being required to understand how environmental benefits influence visitors and the local population,

flow evaluations are not generally employed due to issues with their conception and execution. This gap may hinder coastal tourist governance plans and strategies that include environmental services.

Ecosystem Service Sections

Twenty research (40%) examined all three ecosystem services simultaneously. Fourteen research (28%) examined two portions, and sixteen (32%) examined one, largely cultural ecosystem services. Cultural ecosystem services were examined in 47 research (94%), followed by regulating and support (29; 58%) and providing (28; 56%). Culture ecosystem services are most significant, demonstrating their intimate relationship with tourism and recreational ecosystem services. Beach relaxation, animal viewing, scenic appreciation, and water sports are considered culture environmental services. Studies on tourism's impacts focus on leisure, aesthetics, and visitor happiness. The focus on culture ecosystem services may also indicate that people are realizing how tourism may benefit mental health, unite people, and boost the local economy. Some findings suggest that further study is needed to properly comprehend the mental and physical implications of cultural ecosystem linkages on a bigger scale. Environmental services, which support tourism through fishing, seafood, and coastal employment, weren't given as much emphasis. Tourism increases the requirement for local food production and waste resources, affecting ecological viability. Because they involve complex biological processes and are difficult to evaluate, regulating and management ecosystem services were also neglected. These services include biodiversity, coast protection, climate regulation, and water cleanliness. These are needed for tourism destinations to operate. Tourist management plans may not assess long-term environmental resilience because regulating services aren't displayed frequently.

Categorized Impacts of Tourism on Coastal Ecosystems

Tourism has numerous interconnected consequences. It alters physical, chemical, and biological surroundings.

Coral reefs are easily harmed by visitors. Many reefs are damaged immediately. Anchors, divers and snorkelers touching, and shallow reef strolling break reefs (Baker & Hasler, 2020). Chemical impacts are mostly caused by pollution. Hotel and spa sewage that isn't adequately treated causes eutrophication by adding nitrogen and phosphorus. This accelerates macroalgae growth, beating corals to light and space (Zaneveld et al., 2016). Even in little concentrations, sunscreen chemicals like oxybenzone and octinoxate harm coral DNA, bleach coral, and deform larvae (Downs et al., 2016). These variables reduce coral cover, variation, illness, reef regeneration, and growth biologically.

Coastal tourism threatens mangrove woodlands. Clearing land for resorts, golf courses, and piers causes ecosystem loss and fragmentation (Friess et al., 2020). This reduces mangroves and disrupts ecosystems. Building jetties and causeways can alter water flow, causing hypersalinity or sedimentation that kills mangroves. Tourist facilities contaminate mangrove soils with heavy metals and fuels. Chemicals can accumulate in the food web and harm trees (Lewis et al., 2011). The ecological implications include reduced fish and shellfish nurseries, carbon storage, coastal erosion, and storm surges.

Seagrass meadows are often harmed by tourists. Mooring boat chains and anchors scrape the seabed clean, creating large, vacant fields (Montefalcone et al., 2020). Motorboat propeller scars in shallow water are also terrible. Chemical waste, especially nutrient-rich rubbish, promotes eutrophication. This accelerates algal epiphytes on seagrass blades, obstructing sunlight and reducing photosynthesis. The seagrass dies (Krause-Jensen et al., 2019). Building and boat traffic near the shore add silt, making light transmission tougher. Thus, economically important fish species lose area, water quality deteriorates, and sediment carbon is released.

Tourists visiting Sandy beaches and dunes have a huge impact on the environment. Erosion and pressure from walking and driving damage dune plants and weaken the dune structure (Nordstrom, 2000). Seawalls and groins protecting coastal property often block sand flow, causing "downdrift" damage. Beach feeding operations improve beaches but destroy benthic organisms and modify sand composition. Trash, especially plastics, can get caught in animals and break down into microscopic fragments that enter the aquatic food chain (Jambeck et al., 2015). Light pollution from shoreline construction confuses nesting sea turtles and hatchlings, a major protection issue (Witherington & Bjorndal, 1991). Sea turtles and shorebirds lose nesting sites, and sand intermediate animals diminish.

Table 1: Summary of Documented Tourism Impacts on Coastal Ecosystems

Ecosystem Type	Physical Impact	Chemical Impact	Biological Impact
Coral Reefs	Anchor damage, diver/snorkeler contact, trampling.	Nutrient loading (sewage), sunscreen chemicals, hydrocarbons.	Coral bleaching, reduced biodiversity, algal overgrowth, disease.
Mangrove Forests	Habitat loss for construction, fragmentation, hydrological alteration.	Heavy metal contamination, hydrocarbon pollution, hypersalinity.	Reduced nursery function, lower carbon sequestration, increased coastal vulnerability.
Seagrass Meadows	Anchor/mooring scour, propeller scarring, sediment smothering.	Nutrient loading (eutrophication), chemical pollutants, turbidity.	Reduced habitat for fish, decreased water quality, carbon release.
Beaches/Dunes	Erosion, compaction, habitat destruction from traffic, infrastructure.	Plastic litter, chemical runoff, light pollution.	Loss of sea turtle nesting sites, reduced shorebird populations, invertebrate loss.

Evaluation of Existing Sustainable Management Practices

The review of the relevant literature revealed a few primary management strategies that are implemented in order to mitigate the negative consequences of coastal tourism. Every one of them offers a number of advantages, but when combined, they frequently exhibit significant drawbacks.

Table 2: Evaluation of Predominant Sustainable Tourism Management Practices

Management Approach	Description	Advantages	Limitations
Carrying Capacity Models	Sets a quantitative limit on the number of tourists or developments an area can sustain.	Provides a clear, numerical target; easy to communicate conceptually.	Difficult to calculate accurately; static (doesn't account for seasonality or ecosystem dynamics); often ignores social and economic dimensions; politically difficult to enforce.
Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)	Designated zones where human activities are restricted to protect biodiversity.	Proven to increase biomass and biodiversity within boundaries; can serve as a strong regulatory tool.	"Paper parks" with poor enforcement are common; can displace fishing communities; success depends on size, design, and community support; may simply displace impacts to adjacent areas.
Policy & Regulatory Instruments	Laws and regulations (e.g., Environmental Impact Assessments, water quality standards, zoning).	Legally binding; can set clear minimum standards for development and operations.	Often suffers from weak governance and corruption; lack of monitoring and enforcement capacity; can be slow to adapt to new threats; may create a compliance mindset rather than a sustainability mindset.
Economic Instruments	Market-based tools like tourism taxes, user fees, and payments for ecosystem services (PES).	Creates a financial incentive for conservation; generates revenue for management; "polluter pays" principle.	Can be regressive, affecting low-income tourists/locals; requires complex administrative systems; determining the "right" price for ecosystem services is challenging; revenue may not be ring-fenced for environmental management.

These analyses generally employ various approaches. A site may have an MPA, but its capacity is unknown, and tourism revenue is not utilized to maintain it. This disunity creates gaps that reduce efficiency. Most of these models are inflexible and lack a strong built-in method to learn and modify.

Discussion

The results reveal that coastal tourism, which occurs worldwide, causes significant environmental damage. The impacts are systemic and undermine coastal socio-ecological systems. These impacts' interconnectedness is worrisome. Cutting down a mangrove forest for a resort (a direct consequence) affects the environment and removes a natural runoff filter, which pollutes the coral reef adjacent with nutrients. The cascading effect illustrates that management approaches that focus on one environment or problem are insufficient.

The criticism of present management approaches reveals that coastal habitats are complex and changeable, unlike many government methods. Carrying capacity is criticized for failing to understand ecosystems' nonlinear "tipping points" (Saarinen, 2006). An setting may appear to handle a certain number of visitors until a limit is reached. It then breaks down into a state that is difficult to recover from. MPAs protect the ocean, but they don't necessarily address tourist pollution. This underscores the need of a flexible, networked government.

The Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) Framework

The Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) paradigm is proposed in this research to remediate these systemic inadequacies (Figure 1). We aimed for this conceptual model to be dynamic, operationalizable, and comprehensive. It utilizes a continuous learning loop that incorporates four essential components, going beyond single-solution thinking.

IACTM guides Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management. It has four primary sections connected by a central management and control hub and an adaptive management cycle. It promotes fact-based, inclusive, and flexible beach tourist management to balance environmental conservation and economic growth.

- Ecological Thresholds and Monitoring measures environmental health by measuring coral cover, mangrove health, seagrass density, and turtle nesting. Scientists define environmental restrictions, and real-time tracking data lets managers decide.
- In the second component, Multi-Stakeholder Governance, government, tourism, local, and civil society representatives form a co-management council. Participation makes things clearer, more accountable, and more likely to obey conservation standards.
- Blended Policy and Economic Toolkit is part three. Private regulations of conduct, awareness initiatives, zoning legislation, environmental evaluations, and economic benefits like conservation levies and green certifications are included.



Figure 1: The Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) Framework

The fourth stage, the Adaptive Management Cycle, employs. This implies data is utilized to plan, act, review, and adjust strategy. These sections provide a versatile and long-lasting system that balances tourism and coastal ecosystems.

Conclusion

Coastal tourism is unstoppable worldwide. People always had a maritime connection. However, this article illustrates that this business's current practices harm the environment and its key asset, ecosystems. Coral bleaching, mangrove loss, seagrass loss, and beach degradation threaten coastal communities' long-term economic and social well-being. In this research, multiple management tools are shown to be insufficient to handle the complex, systemic issue. The proposed Integrated Adaptive Coastal Tourism Management (IACTM) system can stabilize the future. The IACTM framework's scientific monitoring, participatory governance, flexible policy toolset, and commitment to constant learning and adaptation make it a complete and dynamic approach to management. This paper provides merely a conceptual model; its real-world applicability has to be tested. Lack of a case study applicability is the fundamental issue. Future research should focus on operationalizing and testing the IACTM framework in other coastal tourism destinations. This includes working with local people to determine biological limitations, construct tracking systems, and establish adaptable co-management institutions. More study is needed to evaluate the economic costs and benefits of trade-offs. This strengthens the sustainability spending business case. To cope with seaside tourism, locals must adapt their environmental views. They must consider it as the foundation of a vibrant coastal economy, not just a resource.

References

- Alongi, D. M. (2008). Mangrove forests: Resilience, protection from tsunamis, and responses to global climate change. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 76(1), 1-13.
- Baker, A. C., & Hasler, C. T. (2020). The impact of SCUBA diving on coral reefs: A review. *Ecological Indicators*, 108, 105734.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528-546.
- Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., ... & van den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387(6630), 253-260.
- Downs, C. A., Kramarsky-Winter, E., Segal, R., Fauth, J., Knapp, J., Martinez, S., ... & Richmond, R. H. (2016). Toxic pathological effects of the sunscreen UV filter, oxybenzone (benzophenone-3), on coral planulae and cultured primary cells and its environmental contamination in Hawaii and the U.S. Virgin Islands. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 70(2), 265-288.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Friess, D. A., Krauss, K. W., Horstman, E. M., Balke, T., Bouma, T. J., Galli, D., & Webb, E. L. (2020). Mangrove coasts: A synthesis of 30 years of study and future research needs. *Oceanography*, 33(3), 38-51.
- Gössling, S., Peeters, P., Hall, C. M., Ceron, J. P., Dubois, G., LaVelle, M. V., & Scott, D. (2012). Tourism and water use: Supply, demand, and security. An international review. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 1-15.
- Hadwen, W. L., Arthington, A. H., & Mosisch, T. D. (2015). The impact of tourism on dune lakes in Fraser Island, Australia. *Lakes & Reservoirs: Research & Management*, 8(1), 15-25.
- Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243-1248.
- Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Poloczanska, E. S., Skirving, W., & Dove, S. (2017). Coral reef ecosystems under climate change and ocean acidification. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 4, 158.
- Holling, C. S. (1978). *Adaptive environmental assessment and management*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Jambeck, J. R., Geyer, R., Wilcox, C., Siegler, T. R., Perryman, M., Andrady, A., ... & Law, K. L. (2015). Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Science*, 347(6223), 768-771.
- Krause-Jensen, D., Duarte, C. M., & Greve, T. M. (2019). Seagrass ecosystems as a globally significant carbon sink. *Nature Geoscience*, 12(11), 945-950.
- Lamb, J. B., van de Water, J. A. J. M., Bourne, D. G., Altier, C., Hein, M. Y., Fiorenza, E. A., ... & Harvell, C. D. (2018). Seaweed-based nutrient pollution fuels coral disease on remote reefs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 285(1887), 20180929.
- Lewis, R. R., III, Gilmore, R. G., Crews, D. W., & Odum, W. E. (2011). Mangrove habitat and fishery resources in Florida. *Florida Sea Grant College Program*.

- Montefalcone, M., Morri, C., Peirano, A., Albertelli, G., & Bianchi, C. N. (2020). The sad story of an endemic seagrass: *Posidonia oceanica* meadow regression in the Ligurian Sea (NW Mediterranean Sea). *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 24(1), 1-10.
- Nordstrom, K. F. (2000). *Beaches and dunes of developed coasts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Saarinen, J. (2006). Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Sustainable Development*, 14(3), 172-181.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207-222.
- Unsworth, R. K., McKenzie, L. J., Collier, C. J., Jones, B. L., Cullen-Unsworth, L. C., & Hays, G. C. (2019). The role of seagrasses in mitigating climate change. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 134(1-2), 145-152.
- UNWTO. (2023). *Sustainable Development of Tourism in Coastal Areas*. World Tourism Organization.
- Walters, C. J. (1986). *Adaptive management of renewable resources*. Macmillan.
- Witherington, B. E., & Bjorndal, K. A. (1991). Influence of artificial lighting on the seaward orientation of hatchling loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*). *Biological Conservation*, 55(1-2), 139-149.
- Zaneveld, J. R., Burkepile, D. E., & Thurber, A. R. V. (2016). Nutrient limitation of coral reef macroalgae. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 558, 1-12.