

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

Martin Potgieter<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Limpopo

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is touching on important issues related to the political ecological management of the Tonle Sap Lake. These issues play an integral role in the livelihood sustainability of communities around the lake as well as the fauna and flora within the lake. However, the ecological integrity of the lake is threatened by upstream development that will impact it negatively. This paper delves into those issues that need urgent attention in order to ensure that the lake can provide sustainable ecosystem services to communities.

The manuscript will, however, need serious revisions in order to be acceptable for the public domain. These include, but are not limited to:

1. The Introduction needs reconstitution by removing unreferenced information and replacing it with political and ecological factors that play a key role in lake management.
2. The Conceptual Framework of Political Ecology section needs to be reduced to 3 short paragraphs. This will aid in making the paper more concise and focused.
3. The methodology is wholly incomplete, missing crucial detailed information, and as such does not lend itself to reproducibility, which is the cornerstone of research. This also leads to a decoupling with results/Discussion section. Refer to the reviewer's annotated manuscript.
4. Missing methodology sections include Study area, Ethical considerations, and Data analysis.
5. There is an uncoupling between Results and Discussion - It is unclear what are the results obtained by this study and what is discussion. This separation must be made clear. Significant information is presented that is not referenced, which creates the impression that it is just speculation by the author. The Results and Discussion section is also very superficial and lacks detailed and in-depth reporting. Significantly, the paper lacks statistical analysis that would have presented an unbiased perspective and narrative.
6. Finally, the paper is exceedingly long, and can be markedly shortened without losing structural integrity.