Revista TOMO, São Cristóvão, v. 44, e22762, 2025
DOI:10.21669/tomo.v44.22762
Special Issue - Coastal Squeeze: Beaches under Socio-Economic and Ecological Pressure
E-ISSN:2318-9010 / ISSN:1517-4549

REVIEW REPORT (C)

ID number: 22762
Completed on: 2025-07-30 05:35 AM
Decision: Revisions Required

The article deals with a rich and instructive field of study. It contains many insightful elements, for example regarding how state agents act as market agents. The fact that the field is in Brazil is obviously important for the journal's special issue, but it is also the approach itself that places the article well within the framework of TOMO's special issue. In short, it deserves to be published. Nevertheless, to this end, we suggest some substantive and formal revisions.

1/ It will be imperative that the final version of the article be reviewed and corrected by a native English speaker (at least, a well-used AI tool could correct some mistakes). The text is indeed not compliant in this regard and contains a number of problematic words or phrases. This sometimes affects the very logic of the argument. For example, the expression "institutional bestowal" is unclear, especially since it later becomes "institutional endowment", then "grant". Furthermore, the article includes some repetitions, both between the introduction and the body of the text, and within the body of the text itself (cf. pp. 3-4 : two duplicate sentences).

2/ The use of Bourdieu's concept of doxa is explained and justified at length. However, other core concepts like "symbolic power" or "symbolic domination" could be more centrally relevant to the argument. Another concept does not appear, which nevertheless seems relevant when reading the text: that of ideology. Is it not an ideology that is promoted and disseminated by the actors, since it involves a discourse that deliberately emphasizes certain aspects while minimizing or concealing others?

3/ The way the method is presented and used is not entirely convincing, for several reasons.

(a) Reading the abstract and introduction, one expects the discourse captured via podcasts to be at the heart of the demonstration. However, this is not really the case. It is even surprising that the article contains no excerpt or dialog drawn from the podcasts in question. There is therefore a discrepancy between the rather lengthy developments concerning this source and the constitution of the corpus (there is mention of coding, etc., p. 8) and the use made of it subsequently. That said, I did not have access to the two appendices announced in the text.

(b) The article actually uses, even if occasionally, several types of sources: it shows an archive, relies on videos... It would be desirable to clarify this from the outset, to better situate the podcast analysis within this whole set. In what way is this an interesting source? In what way does it provide access to narratives that are not found elsewhere, for example in the local press? How precisely were they selected (besides keywords, what time frame?)? In this regard, it might be welcome to add a reference on the use of podcasts (or more generally audio sources) as a source in social sciences. See perhaps (I have not read it): Kulkov, I., Kulkova, J., Rohrbeck, R., & Menvielle, L. (2024). Leveraging Podcasts as Academic Resources: A Seven-step

Methodological Guide. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 23.

(c) The article indicates that it relies on “descriptive statistics”, but this designation seems inappropriate. The article relies on existing data, but it does not appear to apply any treatment that would justify speaking of descriptive statistics.

(d) The cited archival document indicates as source “Historical Archive of Balneário Camboriú”. Is it possible to be more precise and cite a box, a file, with an archival reference number? Furthermore, certain assertions are somewhat troubling, notably this one: “The analysis period covers 2022 to 2024, allowing us to capture how these narratives were shaped and strengthened over time”. The 2022-2024 period is both very short and very recent, so it is difficult to support the argument that it allows a “socio-historical” survey “over time”.

4/ The article positions itself little or not at all in relation to two types of work: on the one hand, those on elites or upper classes in Brazil; on the other hand, those on “environmental justice”, with the coast as a vantage point. Yet the text can make a significant contribution on both fronts. This could be the objective of a revised version of the conclusion.
In this perspective, it would be interesting to make use of work on the representations that elites convey about themselves. See for example (as well as certain articles in the following issue): Thurlow, C., & Jaworski, A. (2017). Introducing elite discourse: the rhetorics of status, privilege, and power. Social Semiotics, 27(3), 243–254.

More specifically, a few additional elements:

- In general, references are sometimes missing to support this or that assertion or data, for example “which represents an increase of 148.61% at national level in the last 20 years”.

- At the end of the text, the article proposes “to look beyond the econometric results”. But it is difficult to understand this allusion if one is not well familiar with the state of discussions in Brazil on the subject. Does this mean that econometric work is dominant in this country, at least on this subject? In that case, it would be welcome to better explain this, to better highlight by contrast the contribution of the submitted article.

- It is not at all certain that it is possible to use an image from the Pixabay site in this way. In any case, usage rights must absolutely be verified so as not to risk infringing intellectual property law.

- It would be possible (even desirable) not to mention the name Spotify, which is a commercial brand: a generic denomination may suffice (“famous streaming platform”).