

The *South African Journal of Science* follows a double-anonymous peer review model but encourages Reviewers and Authors to publish their anonymised review reports and response letters, respectively, as supplementary files after manuscript review and acceptance. For more information, see [Publishing peer review reports](#).

Peer review history for:

Mickelsson M, Thifhulufhelwi R, Mvulane P, Brownell F, Russell C, Lotz-Sisitka H. Bringing river health into being with citizen science: River commons co-learning and practice. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(9/10), Art. #17795. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/17795>

HOW TO CITE:

Bringing river health into being with citizen science: River commons co-learning and practice [peer review history]. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(9/10), Art. #17795. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/17795/peerreview>

Reviewer C: Round 1

Date completed: 06 April 2024

Recommendation: **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

Conflicts of interest: None

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

The number of figures in the manuscript is

Too few/**Adequate**/Too many/Not applicable

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes/No/Not applicable

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes/No

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?

Yes/No/Not applicable

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

Yes/No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes/No

Select a recommendation:

Accept / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

With regard to our policy on '[Publishing peer review reports](#)', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.

Yes/No

Comments to the Author:

The subject manuscript describes a co-created citizen science project concerning the health of upper uMngeni catchment in South Africa. The manuscript starts with an informative and well-researched introduction, methods are clearly described, the data analysis is qualitative and well done, and the discussion and conclusion sections provide useful and well-reasoned interpretations of the project and results. The broad and meaningful engagement with citizens and the co-creation of the project are sterling and to be commended. I think this paper will be of interest to readers of SAJS and will help draw attention to factors that impair the health of the upper uMngeni and may spur changes.

I have only a couple of minor comments for the authors to consider.

Line 96: unclear what is meant by "the gene catchment..."

Line 200: suggest adding reference for miniSASS activities so a reader could learn more about this.

Line 292: extra 'to'

Author response to Reviewer C: Round 1

Line 96: unclear what is meant by "the gene catchment..."

AUTHOR: We corrected the citation.

Line 200: suggest adding reference for miniSASS activities so a reader could learn more about this.

AUTHOR: We added reference and moved reference to clearer speak to the miniSASS activities to enable readers to learn more.

Line 292: extra 'to'

AUTHOR: We removed the extra 'to'.

Reviewer B: Round 1

Not openly accessible under our [Publishing peer review reports](#) policy.