**ANNEX A: Blue Paper Technical Review Form**

Date: September, 12, 2019

Title of Blue Paper: Blue Paper 2: The expected impacts of climate change on the ocean economy

Reviewer: 2

**Overarching Questions**

Reviewers are requested to answer the following questions to assess the overall analytical quality of the contributing paper

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Analysis: Are there any concerns, flaws in logic, or gaps in empirical basis, calculations or theoretical reasoning? |
| **No, the document it is coherent, logical and strongly supported by theorical basis.** |
| 1. Content: Is the paper clearly written, structured, with a logical presentation, and easy to read? |
| **Yes, it is very easy to read, very well structured and also includes and discuss the topics in a logical ways** |
| 1. Content: Does the paper provide a fair and comprehensive treatment of the topic? Are the conclusions justified? Are the recommendations based on the content? |
| **Yes, the topics have a structure that facilitate the comprehension. Also, includes different opinion or research results or tendencies about the same topics. This enrich very much the analyses.** |
| 1. Eligibility for public distribution: Does the paper require minor/major revisions before it is ready for public distribution? |
| **I suggest minor revisions** |

The issues below are suggestions for the reviewer to consider.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **List of issues to be checked** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Were assumptions clearly identified? | Yes |  |
| Is the methodology explained in a transparent way? | Yes |  |
| Are quantitative and qualitative sources referenced appropriately and thoroughly? | Yes |  |
| Does the research effectively address relevant gender aspects? |  | I´m not sure what means this question. It is related to male or female (gender)??? |
| Are there significant and relevant issues that are missing from the paper? | NO |  |
| Are there any faults in empirical basis, calculations or theoretical reasoning? | NO |  |
| Is the information contained in the document up-to-date? | Yes | Very much |
| Does the manuscript present original material and/or an original viewpoint or if it is a synthesis is the methodology comprehensive and appropriate? | Yes |  |
| Was sensitivity analysis performed where applicable? |  | I´m not sure what means this question. |
| Are you aware of any reputable evidence that contradicts the arguments presented in the paper and is not mentioned? | No |  |
| Are the conclusions and recommendations supported by the evidence? | Yes | I found the conclusions so logical and recommendations very useful and congruents |

**3. Memo for specific comments**

The following table is intended to facilitate the work of the reviewers, arbiters and authors and we kindly request you to use this format. This provides space for specific comments, suggestions and responses from the author. The memo will be used to inform the sign-off.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref. no. | Page/ Para/ Line | Comment | Suggestion | Author Response |
|  |  |  | There is no possible to include index after the name of the article? I think that will be useful to offer an overview of different themes that are included in the document??? |  |
|  |  |  | There is no possible to include key words and short abstract? |  |
|  | 1/5/3 | When you said: “wild capture and farmed marine species”. This means fisheries and mariculture, no??? | Because later in a document you use many times both concepts (fisheries and mariculture) so, I suggest that here could be a good place to start mention it. |  |
|  | 2/4 (table)/8 (Others) |  | I suggest give an example of “Others” to clarify to what it is referred. |  |
|  | 3/2/2 | Collectively these system changes have critical impacts on habitats | I suggest include “Biodiversity” because also it is critically impacted |  |
|  | 3/2/3-8 | I think that mainly in the firsts pages are excesive use of two authors: Barange 2018; Gattuso et al. 2015 | I suggest include other references because in four lines are the same four authors many times. Same in the firsts pages of the document. |  |
|  | 3/5/1 | *As these warming trends continue, the suitable distribution ranges of many marine species are expected to shift poleward.*  Couple of years ago, exist article in Science that discuss this theory and conclude that it is no feasible for corals in shallow coral reefs. | I suggest read this article and include these reflexion as in others part if the article where the author offer different perspective of the same point. |  |
|  | 4/3/8 | “whilst benefiting some photosynthetic non-calcifying taxa” | I suggest include a reference also here |  |
|  | 9/3/2 | I´ll looking for the article in Science that discuss this for corals in shallow coral reefs. | Could be interesting offer both different point of view? |  |
|  | 9/3/6 | (García Molinos et al. 2016 | García Molinos are both lasts names (compound last name) or it is García-Molinos??? |  |
|  | 23/3/6-10 |  | What about increase ecoturism alternatives…, share environmental information with general public and tourists??? |  |
|  | 24/1/2 |  | What about fresh water treatment and reciclying? |  |