

Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-647-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on hess-2021-647

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Socio-hydrology, politicization of water science and implication of the Eyes on Earth Study on the contemporary research dialogue in the Lancang-Mekong Basin" by Richard Grünwald et al., Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-647-RC1>, 2022

The submitted paper by Grünwald et al. with the title of "*Socio-hydrology, politicization of water science and implication of the Eyes on Earth Study on the contemporary research dialogue in the Lancang-Mekong Basin*" focuses on politicization of water science and explores this issue in the Eyes on Earth Study and the Lancang-Mekong Basin. While this study provides some good analyses, it lacks the basics for being published in the Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (HESS). Thus, I believe that the paper cannot be accepted, and I recommend re-submission after addressing several concerns:

- I highly suggest improving the paper by a native speaker. I have found several grammar mistakes and a couple of confusing sentences/words.
- The authors have completely mixed literature reviews with the methodology. It is not completely clear what methods are used in this study and how/why they are used. The authors should very clear and specific in the methodology.
- The structure of the paper is quite confusing! Why did the authors jump into some equations and new materials in the discussion? What is the role of the discussion section here?

In addition to these major concerns, I would like to add some additional comments:

- Line1: the word of "socio-hydrology" is redundant.
- Line 11: a general sentence needs to be added at the beginning of the abstract.
- Line 19: it is not clear what the authors want to "re-define".
- The introduction section needs some materials for the literature review on the method.
- Line 56: be specific and mention the challenges, which you want to address.
- Line 118: "(Forsyth)" is not in the references.
- Line 118: you need an explanation for these two references here and explain in what sense you are close to them.

- What do you mean by “formulate the epistemological dangers”?
- Line 147: by “adapted baker’s method”, do you mean you used that method? clearly explain the method before you want to adopt it and elaborate on how this method works. It is very confusing if you used Baker’s method, and how?

I stop at this point as the study should go through a major improvement.