

Review of: "Evaluating Hydrologic, Geomorphic, and Vegetation Parameters to Assess Natural, Living, and Hardened Shorelines along the Northern Gulf of Mexico"

Giseli Machado¹

¹ Federal University of Espírito Santo

Potential competing interests: I declare that I do not have any potential conflicting interests with the authors and data of the work.

General, the manuscript is well organized, with methodology, results and discussion presented in a clear and objective way. However, the introduction deserves to be reorganized, as it maintains the same fragmented style as the manuscript. See introduction comments. excessive use of abbreviations. Excessive use of abbreviations in the manuscript

Abstract: good

Introduction: The introduction is focused on wetlands but does not match the summary. It is fragmented due to the sub-items and so it seems excited for an article.

I suggest that the introduction begins with more general paragraphs and ends with more local paragraphs (focused on the spatial area, area of study and objectives of the article). For example: presentation of the article's theme (general aspects at a global level); presentation of problematic in relation to the theme and issue of natural coastlines, hardened coastlines and live coastlines; importance and definition of wetlands/natural coastlines; importance, types and limitations of hardened coastlines; importance and definition of live coastlines; contextualize the general problem that the theme brings and the difficulty in the study area; briefly contextualize the study area; end with the objectives of the article.

Check the journal rules regarding the numbering of subitems: 1. Introduction; 1.1 Natural Coastlines; 1.2 Hardened shorelines; 1.3 Living Shorelines.

Is this the best way for an introduction? The introduction is broken.

Objectives: seem to be confused with methodological procedures

Results: - Erosion rate and Slope data are missing as results

- Please, check organic matter data." The OM in the low energy LS was less than in the high energy LS sites (Table 3)"

Figures: Figures captions should be improved with some relevant explanations.

Tables are in figure format. That's right?

Discussion: Vegetation can protect a shoreline from erosion... What explains the highest erosion rates in the NS where there are higher density and species richness of vegetation ?