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The article is very interesting and as another commenter said, easy to read. The impressive number of articles analyzed and the methodology explained allows the reader to have a synthesis of the water research in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC).

Regarding figures 5 and 9, it is clear that the larger number of publications are produce in Brazil and Mexico. However, those countries are also the LAC countries which more inhabitans, therefore, it would be interesting to see the same result normalized by the population of each country

Regarding figure 10, as a Hydrologist I am proud of that result, which is totally consistent with the definition of Hydrology (Rosbjerg and Rodda, 2019), that supports the relationship of hydrology whit many other disciplines.

An important finding is the description of the research topics presented in figures 1, 6, 7 and 8. In that sense, it is interesting to verify that statistic methods and water sampling are the predominant methodologies art the articles. Also, I raise the question if that groundwater could be another blind spot at the pacific side of LAC?

Figure 4 produce a feeling of identification for a LAC water science research. It demonstrated that local problems are common to LAC community

Just for discussion and representing those who are not familiar with machine learning I wounder how much difference exists between the results obtaining with the survey and the results obtained with the machine learning methodology. It would be nice to have that chance with the complementary material
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