

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_100859
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Wave and Tidal Characteristics After Marine Sand Mining Using MIKE-21 Modeling: A Case in North Galesong Takalar, Indonesia
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript describe the profile of waves and tides after sea sand mining in Bone Malonjo waters using the Boussinesq Wave module of the DHI-Mike 21 software. Results show that the wave height do not significantly change before and after the sand mining. The article is well organized with a suitable title, sufficient references and a comprehensive abstract. Also, I believe the conclusion is valuable for related management.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The author introduce they are a professional mining machinery manufacturer. The figures in the manuscript are not clearly enough. The statement in the Material and Methods part is not easy to read. I recommend using table to enumerate the data and flow chart to present the work flow. Equations are not edited and labelled in a manner consistent with academic publications. There are some grammar and spelling mistakes.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Minor Revision</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Qi Sheng
Department, University & Country	Institute of NBC Defense, China