Review of: "Policy-Based Water Management Challenges at the Local Level Under Non-traditional Security Perspective: The Case of Hanoi City, Vietnam"

Marina Batalini de Macedo[1]

1 Federal University of Itajubá

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper presents an interesting approach to evaluate WS management effectiveness in Hanoi, which can be easily replicated in different contexts. It presents a simple methodology that integrates aspects related to the services provided to society and the environment by water resources and the costs due to a water crisis, emphasizing aspects related to policy management. This is a very interesting approach, simple and replicable, that can help guide an evidence-based decision-making process.

Apart from the relevance of the topic, the paper is well-written. Some specific comments to improve the comprehension of the text are suggested below.

Specific comments:

WS management and water management are not exactly the same thing. In the title, it should use the exact expression that you are referring to.

Do not include equations in the abstract; it is not usual.

Before figure 1, it should be: “(5) awareness & behavior and (6) projects & programs”, to maintain the same pattern through the sentence.

Why use sum instead of multiplication in the cost-benefit equations? I like approaches with multiplication because if one factor is rated as 0 (which is probably a huge limitation) it can be perceived in the final value; on the other hand, if using sum, it can be “masked.”

I suggest also including the risk definitions of the Sendai framework and UNDDR. I understand that disaster is a little bit different from the perspective you are adopting, but I think the concept can be well applied here, and it is more focused on the subject than the dictionary definition.

Please revise Table 3; I think the column names may be altered by the design of the webpage. There are columns marked with “x” and no column name.

It is interesting to see the indicators and sub-indicators that you have raised, but I don’t know how easy to collect or

measure they are. It would be nice to have examples of data that represent each indicator.

I suggest including all the values of S1, S2, S3, C1, C2, C3 in Table 4, in addition to the provided values, because it helps to identify which components contributed to the final value. You have C1, C2, and C3 values in the text, but I think seeing all of them in the table would be valuable for the readers.