



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_44341
Title of the Manuscript:	Wave Energy Impact on Benin's Coastline Dynamics, Gulf of Guinea
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper substantially is performing all requirements which are being put for examinations of this type. Authors presented very interesting results which are broadening the information in the scope of the wave energy in Benin coastal area, what is influenced by seasonal variability. The title does fully reflect the content of the manuscript. Key words are properly informing. In the Introduction description with clearly argumentation about such kind of investigation is addressed. It is missing the clearly formulated goal of the study. Methods – described in a very comprehensive manner, which facilitates understanding of the presented research results and tracking the description of their interpretation. Results. The amendments require the titles of the tables to indicate that this is e.g. compare something between sample sites. Minor errors are indicted in the text. Discussion place the manuscript well within the body of literature that exists on the wave energy impact on coastline dynamics. I would invite the authors to aim for more synthesis of their findings and clarify the specific scientific contribution of their work in light of the literature including countries neighboring Benin. Is the situation in Benin comparable to neighboring countries or better / worse? Final conclusions are clear and very useful and are supplemented with the most important results from the research.	- Thank you very much for your valuable evaluation and praise for our paper - All your suggestions and recommendations about this section have been taken into account - Thank you for your appreciation
Minor REVISION comments	The text should be very precisely revised again in terms of small mistakes like some lack of spaces between words, writing style (Hs ≈ 1.36m, Tp≈9.6 and P≈15.56kW/m - these are entries once with spaces, once without, you have to take one form and use it consistently throughout the text = abstract and line 374) or repetition of words - small alternations were emphasized and marked directly in the text. Add all corrections consistently throughout the text. Examples to correct: Abstract – line 11 – spacing between words line 21 – the parenthesis is missing: 000 m³/year) line 66 – should be 6 km line 70 – should be December, October line 103 – [22]. In line 113 – C_g denotes line 138 – kg⁻¹ line 143 – better is write: Pastor and Liu [27]; a similar style to use in lines: 166, 167, 177 line 160 – d = d₅₀ the (spacing between words) line 168 – and angle α_b, (one space too much) line 177 – as [34]: (one space too much) lines 184, 186, 187, 206, 207, 232, 234, 235 – unify the record (with or without the space): e.g. 2.5 m or 2.53m line 201 – Fig. 3a average line 231 – rangind – change for ranged line 232 – August line 234, 294 – December line 304/305 – W.m⁻¹ line 325 – 9.4° line 335, 339 – m³/year line 392 – J, Jones Table 1 and 2 – the last column header is unreadable.	- Please, all your preoccupations have been taken into account to update the manuscript - All your suggestions and recommendations have been updated - The text has been reviewed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I suggest the author re-reviewing the text by a native speaker which will definitely improve the readability of the text.	
Optional/General comments	The title enough reflects the content of the paper. Abstract is appropriate informative and adequate to the paper's content. The construction of figures and tables do not create objections. They are graphically very readable. The presentation of Results is logical and put in order so without the problem it can be watch progress of research data. References used in the article were correctly selected to presented problems.	- Thank you very much for your appreciation and praise for our paper

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	