Journal: HESS
Title: Hydrological, ecological, land use, economic, and sociocultural evidence for resilience of traditional irrigation communities in New Mexico, USA.
Author(s): A. Fernald et al.
MS No.: hess-2013-508
MS Type: Research Article
Special Issue: Predictions under change: water, earth, and biota in the anthropocene (HESS/ESD Inter-Journal SI)

Manuscript Evaluation Criteria

Principal Criteria	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (4)
Scientific Significance: Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?	The main contribution is the convergence of analysis coming from hydrological ecological sciences and social sciences, on old acequias systems			
Scientific Quality: Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate		Different steps are used for claiming on acequias		

references)?		resilience resilience but with different ways and methods proposed as specific works and not related common works		
Presentation Quality: Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)?			Many figures are proposed … but no maps to precise where are done the analysis and how it fit in the region	

Details

Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS?	Clearly yes. Through disciplines, multilevel analysis, water issues.
Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?	Yes, for example, the community-based hydrosocial cycle is a useful concept, shared in other contexts (french ones)
Are substantial conclusions reached?	Yes a good summary of the elements presented in the article, hydrological functions, community cohesion,

	adaptative capacities and vulnerability of acequias ssystems
Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?	Because of the limited volume of texts, each part of the article is too shortly explained. I wonder if this article should be transformed in three articles introduced by a shorter one, preparing the articulations between each articles.
Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?	Geographical figures and comments are not well included.
Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?	The paper present only some final results (figures) with few calculation. One curious point is the 2095-2099 period of modelisation…
Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?	Because of twelve authors, the exercice is difficult. Who relates what ?
Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?	Yes
Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?	Yes
Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?	Well, there are three parts well structured but maybe too much separated.
Is the language fluent and precise?	For me, yes
Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used?	Few use
Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?	Maps of the region, the valley and cade studies should be included
Are the number and quality of references appropriate?	OK
Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?	Some figures are difficult to read