

Interactive comment on “Hard paths, soft paths or no paths? Cross-cultural perceptions of water solutions” by A. Wutich et al.

D. Brooks (Referee)

david.b.brooks34@gmail.com

Received and published: 25 June 2013

Access Review, Peer-Review & Interactive Public Discussion (HESSD) In the full review and interactive discussion the referees and other interested members of the scientific community are asked to take into account all of the following aspects: Notes by David Brooks, reviewer: “ Though I am flattered by the number of references to my own work, I feel fully qualified to review this document except for the statistical analysis of qualitative information, with which I am not familiar. “ For convenience only, my responses to the questions appear in upper case letters. “ Where I decline to answer, it is mainly because of lack of knowledge. For example, because I am unfamiliar with HESS, I cannot answer Q-2. 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

within the scope of HESS? DECLINE TO ANSWER

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? NOT SO MUCH NOVEL CONCEPTS BUT NEW PERSPECTIVES ON EXISTING CONCEPTS I HAVE ONE MAJOR QUALIFICATION WHICH IS THAT, EVEN IN THOSE AREAS SEEMING TO SUPPORT SOFT PATHS, FEW MENTIONED NOT JUST DEMAND MANAGEMENT (MORE EFFICIENT USE OF WATER) BUT CONSERVATION (LESS USE OF WATER). GIVEN GROWING POPULATIONS, LESS WATER PER CAPITA AND IDEALLY LESS WATER ABSOLUTELY IS A KEY GOAL OF SOFT PATHS. NOT SURPRISINGLY, SO FAR AS I CAN REMEMBER NO ONE SUGGESTED ANYTHING ABOUT WATER PRICING AS A TOOL. MINOR QUALIFICATIONS - In 1.1, it would be well to note that soft paths have always incorporated public participation in decision making as both end and means - In 1.1 the sentence that begins "While water managers" seems too strong, and probably deserves some citations to back it up. - In 5.3, I would challenge the point that Arizona does not face economic water scarcity – not for drinking perhaps but what about farmers and ranchers.

3. Are substantial conclusions reached? YES, AND VERY IMPORTANT ONES IN THAT FURTHER RESEARCH AND IMPROVED PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SOME POLICIES CAN BE BASED ON THEM

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? YES WITH RESPECT TO ALLTHOSE WITH WHICH I AM FAMILIAR

5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? YES, THOUGH I BELIEVE THOSE INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS SHOULD BE PUT FORWARD MORE MODESTLY. THERE IS A LOT MORE TO BE LEARNED. FOR EXAMPLE, COCHABAMBA IS THE ONLY SITE WHERE GUNS HAVE BEEN USED IN THE MEMORY OF THOSE INTERVIEWED. ALSO, I HAVE BEEN IN ALL OF THE AREAS EXCEPT FIJI, AND I SUSPECT THAT BOLIVIA IS FAR POORER IN ALMOST ALL DIMENSIONS THAN FIJI. SEE NOTE AT THE END ABOUT ANOTHER

HESSD

10, C2801–C2804, 2013

[Interactive
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



TABLE.

6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? YES
7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? YES
8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? YES
9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? YES – THOUGH AGAIN I WOULD PREFER MORE MODESTY IN THE STATEMENTS
10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? OVERALL, IT IS VERY WELL WRITTEN SOME VERY MINOR STUFF - In the numbered series in the Introduction, each sentence after the colon should start with an upper case letter, or none should. -
11. Is the language fluent and precise? YES, VERY MUCH SO.
12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? NOT RELEVANT
13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? POSSIBLY. I FOUND THE LAST SEVERAL SECTIONS SOMEWHAT REPETITIOUS. IT WOULD BE WELL TO HAVE SOMEONE NEW TO THE MS READ IT AGAIN TO SEE IF HE OR SHE REACHES THE SAME CONCLUSION.
14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? YES
15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? NOT RELEVANT. IF ANYTHING, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A SECOND TABLE THAT WOULD PROVIDE DEMOGRAPHIC, ECONOMIC, AND IF POSSIBLE POLITICL DATA ON EACH OF THE FOUR COMMUNITIES STUDIED. I AM NOT LOOKING FOR CENSUS QUALITY DATA BUT ESTIMATES GOOD ENOUGH TO ALLOW THE READER

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



TO COMPARE AND CONTRAST, AND POSSIBLY SUGGEST ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESES. AS IMPLIED BY THE AUTHORS, ONE CANNOT WONDER WHETHER THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE OF COCHABAMBA INFLUENCED THE ANSWERS.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 7809, 2013.

HESD

10, C2801–C2804, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C2804

