

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Physical Science International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_120245</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of water depth and swell parameters on wave propagation in the coastal zone of Benin</b>
Type of the Article	Effect of water depth and swell parameters on wave propagation in the coastal zone of Benin

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of the manuscript is very interesting but the entire manuscript orientation, starting from the abstract to the results are not well written. There is no correlation of the title with the introduction and figures provided.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should try reflecting the objectives of the paper. What does the major objective author try to present to readers and entire scientific community?	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not comprehensive. It is very difficult understand what author try to show. There should follow, major aim, why the study, method provided, and results found in providing comprehensive abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	This is entirely vague. There are several bullet points and equations that could confuse readers. Author should try specifying what important equations employed for the study.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific presentation of this manuscript is not robust enough to be published. I recommend, author write entirely new paper (explicit revision), to present clearly the science of the manuscript. Author should try pay more attention to the method section, figs and discussion of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references should be improved. Author should try present more recent references to substantiate claims.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The entire English of the manuscript need revision.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The entire manuscript needs explicit revision. I do not see need to publish the results presented yet. Author should try write again the paper, provide clear figs and scientific discussion of figs, results and convincing conclusion. The body of the new manuscript should try reflecting the title and results should try clear the research question or objectives of the research.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Chukwuma Anoruo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University do Vale do Paraiba, Brazil</b>