Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-267-RC3, 2019

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Values in water management" *by* Erik Mostert

Francesca Pianosi (Referee)

francesca.pianosi@bristol.ac.uk

Received and published: 26 July 2019

I think the topic is potentially very interesting and useful in a community where these topics are often overlooked or poorly known.

However, in my opinion the manuscript does not fully achieve its goal, because the discussion is too broad and not really tailored to the water management field. One could replace the string "water management" by "climate change adaptation" or "ecosystems conservation" or "landscape management" etc., and most of the paper would read equally well. For example, Table 1 and 2, and relevant discussion: these are all very generic concepts - how do they apply in water management? Can the author gives examples and discuss them?

Similarly, while many references are indeed from water-related fields, their content is not discussed and contrasted in any detail, so one can attach them to the particular

field only because of their titles, not the way they are discussed. For example, P. 11 L. 3: "Example of the use of Q methodology in water management research include ... Forrester et al. (2015)". What's the value of simply listing these references? What I would have expected here is a discussion of how the Q methodology was used in those studies, what they achieved, what limitations were found when applying the method to the water management field, etc.

Because of this lack of specificity, I also found it difficult to fully appreciate the paper conclusions. For example:

P. 13 L. 16: "For water management research actual values seem more relevant than ideal values because they are linked directly with actual behaviour, but ideal values are important too." Where is this coming from? Is it the author's opinion or is it a conclusion from the literature? Where was this discussed?

P. 13 L. 27: "The approach proposed here is to start research at the intermediate level of social groups and organisations and move up or down when necessary for understanding the broader social context, the internal dynamics of the groups and organisations, and the role of individuals. Social groups and organisations are actors in their own right." Again, what experiences / previous findings led the author to propose such approach? Can you give some examples of how it would work in practice (which are the social groups and organisations to be involved, what internal dynamics would be investigated, etc.)?

P. 14 L. 6: "A major conclusion of the article is the importance of different social groups and organisations in water management." What evidence backs this statement? Where was it presented in the review? I might have missed it, but if so, I suppose other readers may do as well?

So in conclusion I think the manuscript is very interesting in principle, but it needs substantial revisions to include concrete examples from water management and more tailored discussion, in order to become a useful contribution to HESS.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-267, 2019.