Revista TOMO, São Cristóvão, v. 44, e22024, 2025
DOI:10.21669/tomo.v44.22024
Special Issue - Coastal Squeeze: Beaches under Socio-Economic and Ecological Pressure
E-ISSN:2318-9010 / ISSN:1517-4549

REVIEW REPORT (B)

ID number: 22024
Completed on: 2025-10-21 11:26 AM
Decision: Revisions Required

The article offers a relevant contribution by discussing the phenomenon of beach squeeze and exploring its manifestations through three case studies in the Brazilian context. It addresses a timely and pertinent topic, especially within the fields of Environmental Education and socioecological studies, as it allows us to examine interactions between society and nature not only in physical and economic terms but also in ethical-experiential ones — that is, as ways of inhabiting and giving meaning to the coast.
The introduction is well constructed, with conceptual clarity and a fluid argumentative structure. However, the terms *beach squeeze* and *coastal squeeze* warrant more conceptual attention. Do they refer to the same phenomenon, or is *beach squeeze* a specific form of *coastal squeeze*? This clarification is essential, as the concept is the central axis of the article and directly shapes how the empirical cases are interpreted and compared.

The article aims to present three case studies in order to highlight discrepancies and similarities between them. Although these relations are efficiently synthesized in Table 01, the text does not develop them analytically. It would be enriching for the authors to make explicit in the main body of the text what the similarities and differences between the cases are, indicating how each of them contributes to understanding the phenomenon of beach squeeze within the Brazilian context. The conclusion could focus specifically on the following two questions:

1. What do the similarities between the cases reveal about the beach as a beach-squeeze space in Brazil?

2. What do the discrepancies teach us about the diverse modes of coastal occupation, use, and appropriation?

The main analytical focus seems to lie in the relationship between erosion/sea-level rise and urban development. Despite regional differences, this relationship converges toward processes of commodification and privatization of beach access — a phenomenon that fits within the broader logic of coastal commodification. In this sense, the comparison between the three case studies could benefit from an analytical through-line that correlates the intensity and temporality of urbanization with geomorphological data — showing how the combination of both results in different degrees and expressions of beach squeeze. In short: the more intense the urbanization and the narrower the sandy strip, the greater the “squeeze,” that is, the greater the spatial and symbolic compression of the beach.

Although the article does not aim to delve into the reasons behind the differences and similarities found, the comparative exercise itself already provides valuable material. It demonstrates that contemporary forms of “beach grabbing” — the guiding concept of the

dossier to which the article is connected — can only be fully understood when geomorphological changes are articulated with urban and social dynamics. This comparative lens makes it possible to identify emerging trends and patterns of beach appropriation that extend beyond the cases analyzed and reflect broader transformations in the relationship between territory, nature, and capital.

Finally, the article could benefit from a more reflective closing section, indicating what we learn from the similarities and differences observed across the three cases. Such a synthesis — both empirical and conceptual — would not only reinforce the originality of the study but also situate the phenomenon of beach squeeze within the broader context of Brazilian coastal experience. The title might also be revised to better reflect the article's content: instead of focusing on challenges, to focus on forms of coastal appropriation based on a comparative study of three Brazilian cases of beach squeeze.