

## Nimby Paper – Expert Comments:

This well-written article discusses the “NIMBY” phenomenon in Israel through the lens of two case studies and interviews with 16 “informants” from both sides of the development issue. The article is coherently structured and generally well argued with a coherent logic. However, several minor issues appear in the article, as noted below.

Be careful not to take sides in the NIMBY debate by categorizing NIMBY actors as systematically less rational than developers and planners. For example, categorizing YIMBY and WIMBY as a “positive approach” in Table I implies that NIMBY is a negative approach whose proponents are to be derided as uninformed, uneducated, etc. Another example is labeling the language of NIMBY protestors as “inflammatory” in the section “Salient features of case 1.” Such a determination is subjective and can only be made by the reader.

In the section “Views of NIMBY: Definition and Approaches,” second paragraph, how can NIMBY thinking be “institutionalized” if it is the thinking of local residents, which cannot be defined a priori but depend on the location of the development in question? An “institutionalized response” can only come from institutions such as universities, government agencies, etc. It cannot come from groups of people whose only connection is that they live near a planned development.

The study focuses on Israel, but the results seem to apply to essentially all non-authoritarian countries. You may wish to clarify this or explain why the results are specific to Israel.

Beware of casting dispersion on the NIMBY activists through the wording. For example, when you say in Case Study 2 “Even though the NOP 32 government planning team held public consultation meetings...” you imply that the upcoming countering element is systematically unreasonable (in this case, the protests of NIMBY activists). You should restrict your narrative to the facts: the government held public consultation, and the NIMBY activists were not satisfied and protested.

In the section “Salient features of case 2,” the association of “high-risk level” with gas and fuel sites seems to support the “doomsday” scenarios of protestors, which weakens your argument of a knowledge gap between protestors and promoters. You may speak of how the risk is mitigated or of accident statistics in Israel, which would presumably strengthen your argument.

With these minor points addressed, the article should be ready for submission for publication.