Review of: "The Political Ecologies of the Tonle Sap: Global, Regional and National Framework for Conservation and Development"

César A. Berlanga-Robles[1]

1 Research Center for Food and Development A.C.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript describes the situation of the Tonle Sap Lake (TSL) in Cambodia, which is the largest freshwater body in Southeast Asia and an essential part of the Mekong River Basin. The study examines the lake's governance from a political ecology perspective, focusing on its ecological importance, environmental challenges, management and development, and economic sustainability and dependencies across different spatiotemporal scales.

Although the manuscript's subject might be of interest to Qeios readers, it cannot be published in its current form due to significant deficiencies.

The methods are not clearly defined. According to the authors, the research was conducted in three phases (related to different projects) in which information was gathered through a literature review, structured interviews, and empirical studies. However, it is not specified what data (variables) were collected with each information gathering strategy and at each stage, nor are any data analysis methods described. This results in a lack of a logical connection between the methods and results, making it impossible to identify which results were obtained from reviews, interviews, and/or empirical studies and at what stage of the research. In fact, the results presented seem to correspond only to a literature review.

There is no real discussion of the results. The authors only describe various processes of the physical environment, inhabitants, uses, and administration of the lake, but do not discuss the implications of the different public policies implemented at different times and scopes on the environment, resources, and lake inhabitants. Only a brief and ambiguous discussion is presented on the impacts of the damming of the main tributary on the flood pulses and the repercussions on fish production.

The conclusions presented are generalities that could be applied to any body of water.

The imprecise and excessive use of acronyms complicates the understanding of the document and can cause confusion, especially for international Qeios readers unfamiliar with the study region.

In its current version, the manuscript does not provide a significant theoretical and/or methodological contribution for international Qeios readers, nor relevant information about the study area for local readers. Therefore, it is recommended to be rejected.