

Review of: "A Review of the Drawdown Zone in African Reservoirs: Current Knowledge, Understudied Areas and Recommendations for Future Research"

Andrés Iroumé¹

¹ Universidad Austral de Chile

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comment:

The article presents a comprehensive analysis of the drawdown zone in African reservoirs. The various topics are clearly and separately addressed, making it easier to understand. It is positive that, after each discussion, the "gap" of information in relation to the topic is identified.

However, I believe that the conclusions could be improved. I do not know if Qeios accepts the inclusion of references in the Conclusions chapter. Please verify and correct.

Currently, in Conclusions, the authors include seven references but without offering a conclusion of their own that synthesizes the development of the article. In addition, in Chapter 5, there is one sentence (probably two) that should possibly be part of the conclusions.

I suggest coming up with a more robust conclusion that reflects the content of the study.

Specific comments:

I have several specific observations/suggestions. I hope the authors find them useful and help to improve the manuscript. They are:

Abstract:

- The authors write about "recent literature." Is it recent literature? Several references from 1986-1987 onwards are used, and then in the Conclusion, they write about "outdated and old-aged articles used in the review" (see page 16/22). Please revise and correct.

Introduction:

- The third paragraph (page 2/22) begins by mentioning the littoral zones without a previous definition. The definition of these zones is in the fourth paragraph (page 3/22). I suggest moving the fourth paragraph to the top of the current third paragraph. In addition, these two paragraphs repeat concepts and are also poorly worded. Please revise and shorten.

- In paragraph 5 (page 3/22), the authors repeat on two occasions about the use of recent literature. Please consider my previous comment and correct.

Material and methods:

- In section 2.1 (page 4/22), the authors write that they did not consider “historical cut-off dates.” Then in section 2.2.1 about document selection (page 5/22), they refer to an initial list of more than 13 thousand articles. Please revise, considering my previous comments about the use of recent or outdated and old-aged articles in the review. Thank you.

- Page 8/22, last paragraph, about the references by McLachlan. Please revise the reference list (page 20/22) as they are not ordered alphabetically. Please revise these and other references to make sure that all those in the text are in the reference list, and vice versa.

- In the first paragraph of section 3.3.3, Marshall 2011, is the same as Marschall 2011? In addition, in the reference list, there is not a Marschall 2011.

Conclusions:

- As already mentioned, this section has seven references. Is this OK for the editor?

- Paragraph from “majority of African reservoirs” in page 15/22 to “Marshall 2011” in page 16/22: it's an issue that was addressed only once in the introduction but not further developed, so not clear why is included in detail here? Can the issues mentioned in this paragraph be considered as gaps? Could be interesting to approach and discuss this.

- A conclusion addressing the gaps summarized in Table 1, is missing. Such a conclusion can give an orientation for the future directions and recommendations for research presented in section 5.

Future directions and recommendations:

- Phrase “Most researches appears to have overlooked the socio-ecological potential and influence of drawdown zones in African reservoirs” (page 16/22) seems like a Conclusion. Please revise and correct from “appears” to “appear”.

- I appreciate phrase “Integrated approaches combining climate change and anthropogenic activities towards lake productivity in drawdown zones of reservoirs necessitate for interminable studies that quantify multiple characteristics of drawdowns such as the duration, frequency, oscillations and rate and the socioeconomic benefits” (page 16/22). But these issues do not seem to have been addressed previously. Do they represent gaps? If they are gaps they should be included in Table 1, and in Conclusions. Please revise.