

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-104-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on nhess-2022-104

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Invited perspectives: Managed realignment as a solution to mitigate coastal flood risks – optimizing success through knowledge co-production" by Mark Schuerch et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-104-RC1>, 2022

Overall, I found this to be an extremely well written and accessible piece – I enjoyed reading it, and thought that the authors brought together the complex aspects of saltmarsh management and issues around MR very well. The framework provided is a useful tool for supporting stakeholder and community engagement design, and clearly integrates different types of evidence, knowledge and value within the process. I am happy to recommend the paper for publication subject to minor revisions suggested below.

- Figure 1 mentions Regulated Tidal Exchanges but these have not yet been described in the text – the focus has been on MR. Suggest editing this so that the text and figure tie together.
- Line 155: this description of the different types of MR is very useful and I think would have been better placed earlier in the manuscript – it could then be used to address my comment above about Figure 1, and could be cross-referenced to at this point in the paper.
- Line 171: suggest adding in some citations to these four lines (particularly line 172)– perhaps some of the work from the CoastWEB project by Meryn Thomas and Erin Roberts, or the RESILCOAST work by McKinley et al., would be useful here (e.g. Uses and management of saltmarshes: A global survey - ScienceDirect)
- Challenge 3: it may also be worth noting that there is limited research on public perceptions of saltmarshes generally – and that actually, there is a tendency for it to focus on MR projects, as limited as this is.
- Figure 3 – I am slightly confused by this image. I like it, but find it difficult to ascertain the direction of travel/ relationships between the different segments. Maybe this isn't the point but my brain automatically tried to work that out, and I doubt I would be the only one. Is there any way this could be slightly clarified to either include these aspects or changed so that a reader isn't trying to assign process to the image (there would probably be a tendency to read it as a top-down process). I also suggest deleting the 's' so it reads 'traditional academic knowledge production' and also suggest changing 'scientist' to 'researcher' as this sort of process would perhaps need to bring in researchers who would not necessarily identify themselves as 'scientists' in the

traditional sense of the word. Would it be 'focus groups' or could it be a range of methods of collaboration between different actors? Could 'focus groups' be replaced with 'collaboration' or 'co-working' or 'co-design' or something like that? Focus groups suggests a very specific social science methodology and I think this approach would probably vary in different contexts – there is also no mention of focus groups in the 6 steps