

Interactive comment on “Migration and global environmental change: methodological lessons from mountain areas of the global South” by A. Milan et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 January 2015

This is a rather peculiar paper : more about methods and future paths of research than about research results. But overall the paper gives an interesting overview of a research project and traces paths for future research. It is up to the editor to decide if this fits into the scope of the journal.

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of ESD?

YES but the paper does only give very few results. It consists mostly of a synthesis of the general discussion on the topic and a presentation of the case studies. There are very few actual “results” corresponding to the research questions raised by the theoretical background (§1.5)[Is migration as a risk management strategy ?]. A large part of

C684

the paper consists in considerations about possible future studies and methodological enlargement.

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? NO

3. Are substantial conclusions reached? NO

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? YES

5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? See 1

6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? See 1 (no results)

7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? YES

8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? YES

9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? YES

10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? YES

11. Is the language fluent and precise? YES

12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Does not apply here

13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

In my view the paper could give much more space to research results but it seems to be the choice of the authors to focus more on a reflexive paper about methods and future research. This is understandable as the “Where the rain falls” research project results were published elsewhere.

C685

14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? YES

15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? YES

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 5, 1711, 2014.