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 (B)

ID number: 22762
Completed on: 2025-08-07 04:50 PM
Decision: Revisions Required

This article presents a timely and relevant contribution to the analysis of real estate overvaluation and coastal urban transformation in Brazil, with a focus on Balneário Camboriú (BC). The articulation between Bourdieusian theory—particularly the concept of doxa—and an original empirical base (semantic content analysis of podcasts and statistical data) is promising and provides critical insight into the commodification of the waterfront.
The manuscript draws attention to how discourses, practices, and institutional alignments contribute to the reproduction of spatial and social inequalities. However, some key theoretical and analytical aspects require clarification and further development to strengthen the internal coherence of the paper and its alignment with the thematic focus of the special issue.
2. Specific Comments
a. Need for Explicit Engagement with the Concept of Beach Grabbing
Considering the scope of the special issue, the paper would greatly benefit from a clearer and more explicit engagement with the concept of beach grabbing. While the manuscript critically addresses processes of exclusion, luxury real estate expansion, and waterfront privatization, it does not directly mobilize the beach grabbing literature.
Inserting this concept would help position the case of Balneário Camboriú within broader global trends and scholarly debates on the privatization and enclosure of coastal commons. It would also strengthen the paper's critical perspective on how public policies and real estate markets combine to restrict access and reinforce selective urban development.
b. Disappearance of the Five Analytical Dimensions
The paper introduces five analytical dimensions—(i) recognition and consensus, (ii) language and discourse, (iii) institutional bestowal, (iv) social distinction, and (v) economic resources—derived from a Bourdieusian framework and semantic content analysis.
This is a very promising analytical tool. However, once introduced, these categories are not systematically mobilized throughout the empirical analysis. Their absence weakens the internal structure of the argument and makes it difficult for readers to follow how theoretical insights inform the interpretation of data.
Suggestions:
• Clearly signal when and how each of the five dimensions appears in the analysis.
• Structure key sections of the empirical discussion around these categories to ensure analytical consistency.
• Consider returning to the dimensions in the final considerations to synthesize findings and reinforce the conceptual contribution.
c. Theoretical Coherence and Argumentation
The theoretical discussion introduces three important points:
1. The beach governed by a doxa. However, after reading, a suggestion is to bring the concept of theodicy.
2. The role of discourse and language in legitimizing hierarchical spatial orders.

3. The intersection of economic, cultural, and symbolic capital in the real estate field.

These are valuable contributions, but they are presented somewhat loosely and disconnectedly. The transitions between them could be improved, and the logical flow needs to be strengthened —especially before presenting the five analytical dimensions.

It is also recommended to replace the term “social laboratory” with “social field” when referring to the beach space, which aligns more directly with Bourdieu’s conceptual lexicon.

d. Methodology: Clarify with Concrete Examples

The description of the semantic content analysis is adequate in its technical outline. However, the reader would benefit from (1) a better justification for the use of Podcasts, and (2) a concrete example of how specific podcast content was categorized and interpreted. A brief excerpt (e.g., a broker's quote) illustrating the coding process would enhance methodological transparency.

e. Identify the Agents Behind the Narratives

In the empirical sections, particularly when discussing the podcasts and digital media, it is not always clear who is speaking or producing specific narratives. It is important to specify whether the voices come from real estate brokers, developers, investors, public officials, etc. This clarification is crucial to reinforcing the argument about the symbolic legitimacy and naturalization of inequality, and would help support a stronger interpretation of these narratives as expressions of a theodicy of privilege.

f. Comments on Realtor Representation and "Smoothing of Gears"

The metaphor of “smoothing of gears”, used to describe the alignment between public agents and developers, is powerful but needs further explanation or illustration. Consider adding a concrete example of institutional leniency or favorable regulation. Likewise, the section describing the broker-client “relationship” would benefit from a clearer articulation. A suggested rephrasing was provided in the comments to emphasize the dual dimensions of security—patrimonial and experiential—at the heart of the market logic.

g. Please see other minor suggested revision within the manuscript, for instance: authors mentioned annexes 1 and 2 but they are not in the paper; standardize “content unit” or “context unit”?;

3. Conclusion

This article offers a rich and original case study that contributes significantly to understanding the symbolic and material dimensions of coastal commodification. Its empirical depth and theoretical ambition are notable. However, to reach its full potential—and to align more clearly with the goals of the special issue—the manuscript requires substantial revision.

Clarifying the analytical framework, recovering the proposed categories, and engaging directly with key concepts such as beach grabbing will enhance the overall coherence and critical contribution of the piece.