

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

Robert R. Lane

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

As written, this manuscript is a simplistic attempt at evaluating living shorelines compared to natural or hardened shorelines. The abstract is so general as to be meaningless and should be rewritten to include actual values from the study. Relevant results that would have been meaningful include shoreline retreat distances, which are described in the methods but not reported in the results (though means are mentioned in the discussion). There are several instances where data are cited to be in a table, but are not there (e.g., pg 10, 4th sentence; pg 11; 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence; pg 15, 8th sentence). The reporting of results is incomplete, for example on page 11 it states 'The mean BD was not significantly different ($F_{1, 259} = 1.006$, $p < 0.32$) between the two energy groups (Table 3)' however, examination of Table 3 indicates that bulk density was different for living shorelines with different exposures. Data interactions were analyzed using nMDS and PCA ordination, but interpretation of the results in a meaningful way is lacking. Simple and obvious correlations are not mentioned, such as there was surely a correlation between fetch and turbidity that could have been identified and perhaps expanded upon. I believe, however, that the manuscript can be salvaged into something relevant with major revision.