

Date: 22 April 2022
Contact person: ir. Úwe S.N. Best
Telephone: +31 (0)6 84759259
Email: u.best@un-ihe.org
Subject: Letter to the Editor



IHE Delft Institute for Water Education

Dept. of Coastal & Urban Risk & Resilience
Coastal Systems & Engineering and Port Development

Visiting address

Westvest 7
2611 AX Delft
The Netherlands

Dear Dr. Giuseppe M.R. Manzella,

Thank you for your comments and suggestions as well as your facilitation and management of the review process. It's most appreciated and the contributions refined the quality of the overall paper.

In addressing the comments made, we have prepared the following:

1. A revised track-changes version of the final manuscript, and
2. The detailed responses to the comments.

Kindly see the text below for our detailed responses to each comment/suggestion by the reviewers (#1 and #2) and yourself. Special attention was given to refining the list of references, condensing certain parts of the text, as well as ensuring fluidity in sections of the paper. We hope that the adjustments made will satisfy all concerns and improve the overall quality of the manuscript. In addition, all figures have been prepared separately in compliance with the guidelines stipulated for authors.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

On behalf of the co-authors

40 **Kindly see the responses to the mentioned comments.**

Dear Dr. Giuseppe M.R. Manzella,

Thank you for reviewing the paper. We replied to each comment/suggestion, see text below.

Best regards,

45 Uwe

On behalf of the co-authors

Comments to the author:

references are not accurate. Please also insert the doi when possible. Here is a list of references to be corrected

50 Thank you. We have revised the below mentioned references based on your advice, as well as the remainder to ensure uniformity and the inclusion of all doi's where possible.

1) Bovell, O.: Setting the foundations for zero net loss of the mangroves that underpin human wellbeing in the North Brazil Shelf LME: Review of the effectiveness of existing coastal restoration efforts in Guyana., 2019. -- This probably is a GEF supported initiative. Please provide information on project and(if possible) web link

55 Noted with thanks. We have amended the reference to include a summary of the requested details. Also, the project was a GEF supported initiative (GEF IW-6 ICM Mangrove Project – GEF ID #9949). It aimed to create the multi-disciplinary information base, regional coordination mechanism and multi-sectoral consensus required to implement elements of a strategic action plan pertaining to the mangroves that most directly underpin human wellbeing in the North Brazil Shelf. The deliverables of the project entailed a series of studies and technical outputs to better
60 understand and manage mangrove habitats and coastal ecosystems to the benefit of human well-being in the North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem Region. Here's the project URL : <https://nbslmegef.wordpress.com/>.

2) Dasgupta, S., Islam, M., Huq, M., Khan, Z. H., and Hasib, M.: Mangroves as protection from storm surges in Bangladesh, 2017. -- Citation: Dasgupta S, Islam M.S, Huq

Noted with thanks. This has been adjusted.

65 M, Huque Khan Z, Hasib M.R (2019) Quantifying the protective capacity of mangroves from storm surges in coastal Bangladesh. PLoS ONE 14(3): e0214079. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214079>

Thank you. This reference has been included as well.

70 3) (FAO) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (change text and reference) -- Food, U. and Organization, A.: The World's Mangroves 1980–2005: a thematic study prepared in the framework of the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2005, 2007

Noted with thanks. The reference has been adjusted accordingly.

4) Parvathy K. G., Umesh P. A., Prasad K. Bhaskaran -- KG, P., PA, U., and Bhaskaran, P. K.: Inter-seasonal variability of wind-waves and their attenuation characteristics by mangroves in a reversing wind system, International Journal of Climatology, 37, 5089-5106, 2017. -- Change text and reference

75 This has been adjusted accordingly. Thank you.

5) McIvor, A., Möller, I., Spencer, T., and Spalding, M.: Reduction of wind and swell waves by mangroves, The Nature Conservancy and Wetlands International, 2012a. 530 (McIvor I capital letter in the text)

Noted. The capitalization of the text has been included.

80 6) McIvor, A., Spencer, T., Möller, I., and Spalding, M.: Storm surge reduction by mangroves, The Nature Conservancy and Wetlands International, 2012b. (McIvor I capital letter in the text)

Noted. The capitalization of the text has been included.

7) Pilato, C.: Hydrodynamic Limitations and the Effects of Living Shoreline Stabilization on Mangrove Recruitment 535 along Florida Coastlines, 2019. -- please specify that this is a PhD thesis

Noted. The thesis type (Masters of Science) has been included in the reference.

85 8) Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., and Bourne, P. E.: The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship, *Scientific data*, 3, 1-9, 2016. -- please add -- <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>

Noted, the doi has been included.

90 9) Willemsen, P., Horstman, E., Borsje, B., Friess, D., and Dohmen-Janssen, C.: Decreased resilience of mangroves 570 stressed by human interference, 2015. -- Please add that this is a Master Thesis

Noted. The thesis type (Masters of Science) has been included in the reference.

Other corrections:

-line 63 - Please specify what 'Region 1' is

95 Noted and the sentence has been adjusted accordingly. It now reflects that Region 1 refers to the Barima-Waini coastline in Guyana.

-line 346: there is a double parenthesis ((

Noted with thanks. It has been adjusted.

100

105

110

115

Dear Dr. Edward Anthony,

120 Thank you for your comments and suggestions as well as the time spent during the review process for the manuscript.
It's most appreciated and refined the quality of the overall paper. Kindly see the text below for our detailed responses
to each comment/suggestion.

Warm regards,

Uwe

125 *On behalf of the co-authors*

Detailed responses to the comments of Reviewer #1

• The article proposed by Best et al. is appropriate to support the publication of a data set aimed at assessing the
potential of mangrove restoration works in Guyana, where largescale removal has been followed by a mangrove
130 restoration project. This dataset is diversified and multi-facetted with complimentary items and corresponds to
a state-of-the art acquisition and treatment of information on waves and their attenuation across muddy
substrates and mangroves, the associated sediment properties of the substrate, as well as mangrove
characteristics and vegetation density. The dataset proposes some common standards for comparison and the
establishment of interesting new norms of determining mangrove vegetation density. The dataset is significant,
135 unique, and useful. There are no inconsistencies in the dataset and the supporting article and the dataset itself
are of good quality, especially in the light of the difficult muddy environment of the Guianas.

We would firstly like to thank you for the validation of the value of the dataset along the Guyana coastline. Given
your expertise in coastal morphodynamics and applications along the Guianas coast, we are pleased by your
overview of the acquisition and the findings of the measurement campaign. Indeed, the use of common
140 standards was intentional to allow for comparisons to similar sites regionally and internationally.

• My comments are minor and essentially concern better referencing with due attention to previous works that
have been forerunners on the theme developed within the dataset:

Line 55-58: the significant removal of mangroves on the Guyana coastline and the potential deleterious effects on
145 coastal risks and stability were treated by Anthony and Gratiot (2012)* who noted in particular the potential
difficulties and pitfalls of mangrove restoration following removal. In a similar vein, the large-scale removal
of mangroves in French Guiana, which lies on the mud-bank belt updrift of Guyana, has been shown to result
in a considerable reduction in the capacity of mud banks to become attached to the coast (Brunier et al.,
2019)*, a process important in attenuation of wave energy, thus further strengthening the rationale for this
150 dataset paper.

*Anthony, E.J., Gratiot, N., 2012. Coastal engineering and large-scale mangrove destruction in Guyana, South
America: Averting an environmental catastrophe in the making. *Ecological Engineering*, 47, 268-273.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2012.07.005>

*Brunier, G., Anthony, E.J., Gratiot, N., Gardel, A., 2019. Exceptional rates and mechanisms of muddy shoreline

155 retreat following mangrove removal. earth Surface Processes & Landforms, 44, 1559-1571.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4593>

Thank you for highlighting the connections to the mentioned articles which are certainly key references for the implications of mangrove removal and the importance of mangrove restoration. We have reviewed the entire article for the inclusion of similar works and have included the works mentioned above.

160

- Other minor points:

Line 173: Satellite coverage is not the only alternative remotes-sensing method for monitoring bed level elevation within mangroves in the Guianas. Proisy et al. (2009)* used dense clouds of data points generated by LiDAR to monitor bed topography under mangroves in neighbouring French Guiana.

165 *Proisy, C., Gratiot, N., Anthony, E.J., Gardel, A., Fromard, F., Heuret, P., 2009. Mud bank colonization by opportunistic mangroves: a case study from French Guiana using lidar data. Continental Shelf Research, 29, 632-641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2008.09.017>

170 Thank you for mentioning this. Definitely, the use of LiDAR techniques have been quite instrumental in progressing the bed topography capture within mangrove fringes. However, the intent behind line 173 was to justify the use of one particular ‘traditional surveying’ instrument (Precision Automatic Level / theodolite) over another (Differential GPS). We have amended the sentence to ensure the meaning is made clear and the reference mentioned has been included.

- 175
- Lines 181, Lines 303-310: Sediment samples (instead of soil samples, and mud substrate instead of soil). The study does not have a pedological objective.

This is most helpful. We agree and have adjusted the text within the document accordingly.

180

185

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your comments and suggestions as well as the time spent during the review process for the manuscript. It has been most appreciated and quite useful. We have reviewed the overall structure and content of the manuscript and made the necessary adjustments. Additionally, kindly see below our detailed response to each comment/suggestion.

Warm regards,

Uwe

On behalf of the co-authors

195 **Detailed responses to the comments of Reviewer #2**

Wave attenuation potential, sediment properties and mangrove growth dynamics data over Guyana's intertidal mudflats: assessing the potential of mangrove restoration works

This is an interesting topic and important for the literature. In addition, this is a well organized

study from a region where there is a paucity of this type of research. This makes the data presented here worthy of publication. The methodology and design of the research project is acceptable. No comments and suggestions are given for further improvement. Manuscript is quite long. Summarize it. So, highly recommended to summarize the text of this manuscript.

Finally, I suggest "accepting" this manuscript with "minor correction".

We highly appreciate that the reviewer considers the data set of wide utility. We accept the suggestion to summarize the highlighted sections and have strived to achieve this.

- Introduction (general comment A)

I feel that the introduction is quite long and you can reduce text by 10-20%. Carefully think and revise considering repetition of meaning. In the Introduction, you need to clearly state what is the scientific question you are addressing? And how you will do it? Why is it important for international readers to care about your manuscript? What is the novelty of your manuscript. These points should be addressed in the Introduction.

Thank you for your suggestions. We have reviewed the content of the introduction with your mentioned points in mind. We have also reiterated the value to the international community while summarizing the text where possible.

- Lines 35-40 [C1]: "Mangroves belts are key ecosystems residing in the intertidal area of tropical and sub-tropical coastlines and a key component in the discussion of green-grey infrastructure (Blankespoor et al., 2017; Kg et al., 2017; Horstman et al., 2014; Beck, 2016; Borsje et al., 2011; Bao, 2011)." Please refer the journal guidelines and follow the reference in alphabetical or chronological order (check authors guidelines). Consider this comment here after.

Thank you. It has been set to the chronological order.

- 225
- Lines 40-45 [C2]: “in the intertidal area: tidal flooding, exposure to waves and varying degrees of salinity(Mazda et al., 1997; Mazda et al., 2006; Hogarth, 2015; Willemsen et al., 2015)”. You can refer this recent article in *Journal of Coastal Conservation* 22, 1191–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-018-0628-7> for understanding how seasonal and tidal influence for water quality changes (e.g. pH, temperature, ORP, conductivity/salinity)along the mangrove covered coastal aquifer.

This is a very interesting study. Thank you for sharing. We have included this in the revised text.

- 230
- Lines 50-55 [C3]: “Therefore, there is a vital need to explore in depth the physical contribution of mangroves locally to reducing coastal vulnerability to hazards such as sea level rise and extreme waves in order to adequately optimize the project planning and designing phases for green- grey infrastructure.” You can read/refer this case study published in *Geoenvironmental Disasters* 7, 17 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40677-020-00154-y> for understanding sea-level inundation and risk/vulnerability assessment in coastal areas.

235 Thank you for sharing. We have included the recommended reference as well as the study by ‘van Zelst, V., Dijkstra, J. T., van Wesenbeeck, B. K., Eilander, D., Morris, E. P., Winsemius, H. C., ... & de Vries, M. B. (2021). Cutting the costs of coastal protection by integrating vegetation in flood defences. *Nature communications*, 12(1), 1-11’.

- 240
- Lines 12 and 53 [C4]: You have mentioned sea-level here. Refer *Palaeogeography Palaeoclimatology Palaeoecology* 465, 122–137.

245 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2016.10.024> This study investigated how mangrove react with sea-level changes. This paleo study suggested mangrove spread widely with initial sea-level inundation in coastal areas during the middle Holocene sea-level stand about 7500 Cal. years BP, based on biomarker proxies (e.g. taraxerone) in sedimentary organic matter.

Most interesting study indeed! However, we do believe that the citation is not best suited in the specified lines.

250 Moreover, the study by the IPCC, ‘*Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., ... & Zhou, B. (2021). Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IPCC: Geneva, Switzerland.*’ and by ‘*van Zelst, V., Dijkstra, J. T., van Wesenbeeck, B. K., Eilander, D., Morris, E. P., Winsemius, H. C., ... & de Vries, M. B. (2021). Cutting the costs of coastal protection by integrating vegetation in flood defences. Nature communications, 12(1), 1-11*’, are better suited in this context.

- 255
- Lines 70-85 [C4]: It is very long chapter with having a single reference of Bovell (2019) for supporting your statement (Bovell, O.: Setting the foundations for zero net loss of the mangroves that underpin human wellbeing in the North Brazil Shelf LME: Review of the effectiveness of existing coastal restoration efforts in Guyana., 2019). I also feel that this is not peer reviewed index journal publications. Consequently, to address why is it important for international readers to care about your manuscript? you can refer (1) Expert assessment of future vulnerability of the global peatland carbon sink. *Nature Climate Change* 11, 70–77.

260 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00944-0> for predict present and future condition of carbon sink, and (2) The Anthropocene Review 5, 28–68.<https://doi.org/10.1177/2053019617740365> for elaborating/showing evidence of first human impacts and responses of aquatic systems in the world.

Thank you for your feedback. However, the intention behind lines 70 – 85 is to describe the system dynamics specific to the Guianas and to provide context for the project site where the measurements were collected.

265 Unfortunately, the references you provided do not add to this regional context. The Guiana’s is a major mangrove coastline from a global perspective and shares many ecological (mangrove species habitation) and morphological (transitioning coastline with migrating mudbanks) similarities with other coastal mangrove fringes regionally and internationally. Therefore, the applicability to an international reader is certainly based on these similarities as well as in the case study of the wave dynamics along a restored mangrove fringe. The references provided in this section are based on the published works of Pieter Augustinus (1978) and one of the deliverables (by Bovell, 2019) from the regional project “ Setting the foundations for zero net loss of the mangroves that underpin human wellbeing in the North Brazil Shelf LME” (which comprised both local and international experts in the field).

275 • Lines 110-115 [C5]: “2.1 System characteristics”: the term study area is better (I feel).

Thank you for your feedback. However, the entire section 2 refers to the study area, whereas section 2.1 describes specifically the hydrodynamics and morphology of the area (hence the use of ‘system characteristics’). This we feel better describes the section in question.

280 • Lines 125-130 [C6]: 120m – 400m: Need a space between value and unit. Consider this comment here after. I found that such several formatting issues. Consider it during revision of your manuscript.

This is most helpful. We agree and have adjusted the text within the document accordingly.

285 • Lines 128-138 [C7]: a. “tidal range fluctuating between 1.17 m during an average neap tide and 2.5 m during an average spring tide”, b. “The strongest winds occur in the period December – March/April and vary between 3 - 8 m/s from a predominant northeast direction”, c. “The measured currents, at 25 m depths offshore, have a magnitude between 0.1 and 0.5 m/s and a direction varying between 240 °N and 360 °N.”, You need to include supportive evidences/references for those statements. In this manuscript, you need to consider this comment here after, such direct statements with values.

290 Thank you, this is most helpful. We have adjusted the text accordingly.

• Data collection field site (general comment B)

Again, I feel that “2.1 System characteristics” is quite long and you can reduce text by 10%. Carefully think and revise considering repetition of meaning. Similarly, sections from 2.2 to 2.7 are also quite long and you can reduce text.

295 We have revised the heading for section 2 to ‘Field site & data collection methodology’. Section 2.1, has been revised with your comments in mind. However, sections 2.2 to 2.3 (in updated version, previously 2.2 – 2.7)

detail the layers of the methodology for all individual datasets. This is a requirement of the journal for all data papers and allows for replicability among the scientific community.

300

- Line 160 [C8]: “Data Collection and Processing” It is separate sub-sub section? 2.2.1????
This has been revised to 2.3 with sub headings 2.3.1 – 2.3.5.

305

- Results (general comment C)
Results part is well written. However, you have to define abbreviations at its first appearance (e.g. ASTM).
Consider this comment here after.

Noted with thanks.

310

- Discussion and conclusions (general comment D)
D1: The authors must separate Discussion and Conclusions.
D2: You have already discussed your discussion under chapter 3. Results, 4. Wave attenuation potential for mangrove belt, and 5 Data availability.
Consequently, you can follow the recommended/standard format of 1. Introduction, 2. Study area and Methodology, 3. Results, 4. Discussion, and 5. Conclusions.

315

Noted with thanks. We have made the necessary adjustments: (1) section 3 has been renamed ‘Mangrove characteristics and environmental conditions’ and provides jointly the results and discussion aspects. (2) There is now a separate conclusion section. We have adopted the format outlined in the journal requirements.

320

- References (general comment E)
I have observed that only few references are from the recent literatures. Consequently, I highly recommended to add few additional recent literatures which are published during few years. Researchers must be up to date and updatable. I have suggested few references as well.

Regional Studies in Marine Science 30, 100726.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsma.2019.100726>

Regional Studies in Marine Science 46, 101884.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsma.2021.101884>.

325

Noted with thanks. In the revised version at least one third of the references are within the last 6 years.

330

- Figures (general comment F)
F1: Figure 1: I can’t read some text in even 139% magnification (see location names in A and B images). I can’t get any relevant information from Figure 1C (must increase the size)
F2: You must improve the quality of photographs such as 3, 4, 6, 12. But, I don’t know whether it is technical error during the generation of PDF from your world file.

Thank you for your feedback. All figures have been prepared separately to the required resolution as stated by the journal. These figures will be included in the final stages of the review process. They have been reviewed with your comments in mind. Additionally, Fig.1 C as mentioned in the caption shows only the development of the spatial extent of the fringe 10 years post-restoration.

335

- (general comment G)

There are too many errors in the structure of the manuscript. See several comments above (but, I did not mention every point). The author must carefully revise the manuscript. In my conclusion, the manuscript has several repetition, many basic errors, no clear discussion.

340

I very strongly suggest that the authors have their manuscript revised by a qualified scholar or carefully revise it.

I hope the review a revised version of this work (if necessary).

Thank you for your feedback. It has been most useful. We have reviewed the overall structure and content of the manuscript and made the necessary adjustments.

345