

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

Carel Dieperink¹

¹ Utrecht University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review The Political Ecologies of the Tonle Sap

This paper addresses an interesting topic. It contains a lot of interesting information on TSL, but it needs a better conceptualization and structure. The paper is too descriptive. The overall aim of the paper is not clear and the relevance of the difference section for meeting this aim as well as the links between the sections needs more clarification. The Conclusion should be based on the analysis.

Detailed comments

Second part of the title is not clear

Abstract

Please change in the first line TSL for Tonle Sap (TSL) Afterwards you can use the abbreviation TSL;

Explicate what knowledge gap the paper addresses

Introduction

Reconsider the first part of the sentence in which you clarify how TSL is fed. Is 83.1 km³ the contribution of the Mekong or does it refer to the total influx in the lake?

The same remark can be made about the outflow in the dry season.

The author argues that TSL is biodiversity rich, but fails to add references to substantiate this statement.

The section on the 1995 MRC Agreement also lacks references.

In the Introduction you must identify a knowledge gap (in the literature on political ecology) and make clear what the aim of this paper is.

Check the sentence starting with On the contrary.... You could also skip it and concentrate on political ecology.

Check the sentence starting with Central to numerous: you talk about three concepts, not one.

Second 2 gives an overview of the literature on political economy but does not result in some kind of analytical framework the author uses for the analysis; the author must clarify what concepts will be used in the further analysis.

In the methods section the author argues that a framework will be developed. This point is not clear. I would say this has or should have been done in section 2. This remark refers back to my earlier remark that the author should be clear about the aim of the paper. The aim of the paper could be to get insight into..... , to explain something, the assess something and/or to design something. It should be specified in the Introduction.

It is nice that the author has collected data over a long period of time but this data collection should be based on/linked to the analytical framework mentioned earlier. Explicate why the data sources you have used are relevant for your study. This is more important than referring to your (earlier) affiliations.

The author must refer to the map in the text. Figure 1 is not clear. What is meant by studied areas? The areas where the data collection took place? The paper in the end is about TSL are – from a political ecology perspective – about the whole Mekong basin.

You must help the reader a bit, so start the results section with a sentence in which you tell what will follow.

Why is section 4.1. in? It gives a more in dept description of the TSL area, but is not linked to political ecological concepts.

The concept Global Space in the title of section 4.2 needs a clarification, what is meant by it, why is it relevant and how does it relate to political ecology. Are spaces reproduced by powerful actors?

The author makes a distinction between spaces on different (global, national, regional) level. All these concepts need a clarification and a motivation. Why is it necessary to use them? Are they part of the analytical approach (and linked to the literature on political ecology)? If yes they need an elaboration in section 2.

In heading 4.6.2 Intuitions should be replaced by institutions.

In the Conclusion the author states that space is constructed and reconstructed by different actors. This statement should result from the previous analyses. At the moment this is not the case. A suggestion could be to use the concepts construction and reconstruction as headings in the results section. These then need a rewrite to show the readers better what is actually (re)constructed and what power dynamics play a role. These concepts need a better clarification in section 2.