

Comment on manuscript
'Socio-hydrology, politicization of water science and implication of the
Eyes on Earth Study on the contemporary research dialogue in the
Lancang-Mekong Basin'

Summary:

The article focuses on the Eyes on Earth Study which can be seen as a typical reflection of politicization of water science, revealing the forming process and Socio-hydrological mechanism of politicization impacting scientific research dialogue. The author has performed detailed analysis based on review of contemporary literatures on research dialogue in the Lancang-Mekong River Basin. The results are reliable, but the way of displaying and describing the results needs to be further improved. A major revision is suggested.

General comment:

- (1) The authors have carried out multiple analysis on the Eyes on Earth study but did not give a clear introduction on the definition of Eyes on Earth study. The term Eyes on Earth study has been mentioned for many times but there's no clear definition of it in this article. According to description is this article and other information online. The Eyes on Earth study, on the surface, is a detailed global observation and analysis of changes in the land-surface environment, but its research conclusions can be influenced by political tendencies.
- (2) Another article named 'Politicization of science in the Lancang–Mekong Basin: the Eyes on Earth Study' (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07900627.2021.1990025>), which is written by the authors of this manuscript, also reviews the Eyes on Earth study and analyzed the pollicization of science. The only difference in keyword between this manuscript and the previous article is 'research dialogue'. Therefore, I would expect a detailed explanation by the authors on the difference between this two research.

The detailed comments are listed below.

Comment list:

Page 3, Table 1: What is the judgment basis for distinguishing 'standard' and 'alternative'?

Page 6, Table 2: For the second column, a more accurate word is expected to strengthen the relationship between the two columns than 'Note'.

Page 8, Table 4:

- (1) It seems the 'Drivers' here can be also seen as 'purposes'. More accurate expressions might be needed.
- (2) Why the drivers, outcomes and impacts of Opponents are not categorized into three groups?

Page 10, Table 5:

Whether the 'Results' here can also be seen as details of the 'Issue'?

Page 12, Table 6:

The logical association between (the names of) the categories in the first column should be stronger.

Page 17, Table 7:

(1) More clear and accurate names/descriptions of categories are needed here. It seems the first column are official meetings and publications, the second and third columns are scientific studies and opinions, but what is the main difference between them?

(2) About the title of Table 7 'List of research and policy inputs from multi-stakeholders intended for facilitating the research dialogue': Should the 'Inputs' here be 'Responses'? The keyword of table description here should be consistent with the column title in the table.