Peer Review Report

Review Report on Mexico City – Ambitions and challenges of integrated risk management in a fractured urban planning context

Original Research, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Joel C. Gill

EVALUATION

Q 1   Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This study explores urban and environmental policy in Mexico City, with respect to risk management, and asserts that addressing the challenges of integrated risk management in a fractured urban planning context will require institutions to be adaptive, maintain strong links with academia, and create long-term plans integrated across tiers of government endorsed by the city's communities.

Q 2   Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The discussion is topical. Strengthening integrated risk management in complex urban environments closely aligns with the ambitions of the Sendai Framework, and recent publications (e.g., https://www.undrr.org/publication/hazard-definition-and-classification-review-technical-report). The manuscript is essentially a perspectives piece / commentary, reflecting on lessons from the past for improved integrated risk management.

However, the manuscript includes many sections where assertions are made, but no evidence is provided. The manuscript is therefore not rooting its recommendations in an evidenced-examination of the current literature or in primary data (e.g., interviews, focus groups). This is a major weakness of the paper, and not constrained to one or two places. It isn't clear if the evidence to support these assertions is widely documented in the literature (peer-review or grey) but not referenced here, or if these assertions are the authors opinions. If the latter, the manuscript would benefit from being clearly labelled as a perspective piece rather than original research.

Q 3   Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The paper does not detail a method being used, or describe the data being used to generate its conclusions. It describes the strengths/weaknesses of past approaches – but assertions are mostly unsupported. One can presume the conclusions and recommendations are generally sensible at a high level, but they can't be related to data that has been introduced in the paper and discussed in the context of existing literature.

Q 4   Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?
    Yes.

Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?
    Yes.

Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?
    No.

Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)
  Not Applicable.

If relevant, are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?
  No.

Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)
  No.

Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?
  Not Applicable.

If relevant, have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?
  Not Applicable.

Q 5   **Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):**

Q4 – Note on ethics: I have selected not applicable as the article is set out as a perspective piece and no data (e.g., interviews) mentioned. If the article is revised and primary data introduced, then this will need to be reconsidered.

I have attached a detailed review report.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

		Rating
Q 6	**Originality**	■■□□□
Q 7	**Rigor**	■□□□□
Q 8	**Significance to the field**	■■□□□
Q 9	**Interest to a general audience**	■■■□□
Q 10	**Quality of the writing**	■■■□□
Q 11	**Overall quality of the study**	■□□□□