



REVIEW REPORT (A)

ID number: 23684

Completed on: 2025-09-29 01:47 PM

Decision: Revisions Required

The article “Sociotechnical Coastal Squeeze: Technology, Tourism, and Governance on Copacabana’s Waterfront” is an important contribution to beach studies.

This article argues that the dynamics associated with the diffusion of the Technical-Scientific-Informational Milieu—highlighted and amplified during the New Year’s Eve event—currently result in a compression of Copacabana’s beach ecosystems and public uses of the waterfront. We refer to this process as a *sociotechnical coastal squeeze*. Contributing to this are the dynamics related, on the one hand, to the pressures of the globalized tourism economy and commercial interests, and, on the other, to the increasingly rigid and technologically reinforced barrier of state control infrastructure and private governance.

To do so, the article presents a historical overview of the production of Copacabana, addressing not only spatial transformations but also new conceptions of the environment and the ways in which emerging technologies produce changes on Copacabana Beach. This approach also makes it possible to reveal the “hidden density of beach infrastructure,” which exposes the complex layering that sustains urban life.

Some suggestions that may help strengthen the argument:

First, the proposal to analyze transformations through the notion of *sociotechnical coastal squeeze* is highly suggestive and offers a productive way to reflect on complex transformations and the forms of governance that operate over populations and space. At the same time, the article states that “the phenomenon of sociotechnical coastal squeeze manifests itself not only in physical compression, but also in an ‘informational squeeze.’ The barrier to public use is no longer only the hard infrastructure, but a mesh of regulations, registries, apps, and surveillance systems that govern who can be in the space, how, and when.” It would be interesting to further develop the distinctions between these dimensions and to elaborate on how technological transformations explain the field of possibilities for the implementation of new forms of urban life, in connection with the statement that “the analysis of the spatial arrangements of Copacabana’s waterfront demonstrates the emergence of a new synthesis, a spatial adjustment that transcends the modernist paradigm of large-scale engineering.”

Another central point that helps clarify the importance of the beach and the relevance of its governance/production is the following passage: “The geographical analysis of the sociotechnical system that territorially configures Copacabana’s waterfront can be guided by the interpretation of three types of complementary spatial arrangements: longitudinal, transversal, and vertical.” In the text, however, the transversal dynamics are not fully developed; the longitudinal and vertical dimensions are more elaborated. This invites a discussion of ‘informal’ arrangements (the article mentions, for example, the centrality of informal commerce). The

question, then, is: what kind of *sociotechnical coastal squeeze* occurs between the arrangements produced by different ways of understanding the space? “Copacabana Beach has thus become a microcosm of the urban economy, where both circuits coexist in a visible relationship of complementarity and competition,” but this microcosm needs to be understood through these transversal dynamics.

This leads to the question: what conflicts emerge in this production? Another key point is the role of tourism. Although tourism appears as a necessary component, it would be interesting to approach it as a dimension that actively shapes this process of governance production—especially because the title foregrounds the notions of technology, tourism, and governance. A more in-depth theoretical development of these notions would strengthen the argument. The discussion of the New Year’s Eve case is extremely interesting, insightful, and effective. However, this potential seems to dissipate as the text progresses. It would be worthwhile to revisit the New Year’s Eve event to better understand the multiple ways in which it relates to sociotechnical transformations. I believe that New Year’s Eve emerges as an “event” that reveals far more than what is currently developed in the article.

In addition, contrasting the case with literature on similar examples elsewhere could contribute to a deeper analysis of this kind of transversal governance, which extends beyond Rio de Janeiro (the article briefly mentions platform economies, for example). This would help clarify the power relations involved and the specific characteristics of Rio.