

Review of: "Larache's Coastal in Morocco: Evaluating Dredging's Impact on Fisheries and Shoreline evolution"

Mohd Saiful Samsudin Samsudin¹

¹ Universiti Sains Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I thank the editor for the opportunity to review this paper.

The research paper entitled "Larache's Coastal in Morocco: Evaluating Dredging's Impact on Fisheries and Shoreline Evolution" provides a thorough investigation into the ramifications of dredging operations on the Larache coastline, examining both physical and biological dimensions. The study uses tools like Google Earth to carefully analyze how the area has changed over time, considering things like sediment movement, weather, and the different types of life in the area. While the paper gives clear instructions on how the authors conducted the research, the authors could include more details on how they collected and analyzed data to make the study stronger. The results are easy to understand, with pictures and charts to help explain them, but using more statistics could make the findings even stronger. The discussion part of the paper looks at why these changes are happening, pointing out both natural causes and things people are doing. It also suggests ways to help protect the area in the future. The conclusion sums up the main points well but could be clearer in some places. The paper does a good job of explaining how dredging affects Larache's coastline, but it could be improved with a few small changes.

However, in my opinion, the paper needs some improvements. First, the summary and start need to be more clear about what the research is about. The part explaining how the study was done could be better by giving more details about how the authors collected data and how they analyzed it. The authors should also use statistical tests to make their findings stronger. In the discussion, the authors should talk more about the problems in their study, like if they didn't have enough data or if there were mistakes. The authors also need to say what future research could look at. The language in the paper is mostly good, but there are some parts where the authors repeat things too much or have small mistakes in grammar. Lastly, the authors should look at more studies to help support their ideas and find gaps in what we know. Fixing these things will make the paper better and more helpful for other researchers and people making decisions.

Therefore, with revisions to address the identified weaknesses, the manuscript could be accepted for publication. However, it is crucial to strengthen the methodology, provide more robust statistical analysis, discuss limitations, and suggest future research directions to enhance the manuscript's quality and contribution to the field.