

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

Nebiyu Wolde Girgibo¹

¹ University of Vaasa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer comments

Name: Dr Nebiyu Girgibo

Date: 07/02/2024

Title of paper: Larache's Coastal in Morocco: Evaluating Dredging's Impact on Fisheries and Shorelineevolution

Authors: Mohammed Saddik, Ilham Zoubeydi, Khaoula Lagrini, Hasnae Achchab

Comments

1. **General comments:**

- I am not sure if this is a journal article or an internet news publication? It is not qualifying the standard of journal article formats and contents.
- From the first glance, the format of an article is recommended to use IMRAD.
 - Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion (IMRAD) format + mostly conclusions and bibliography/references.
 - Some sections would be better combined in some of these four sections of a formal article format.
 - Conclusions are written very poorly.
- All sections require more text and explanations.
- A poor method was used.
- Very significant improvements are required in terms of the overall article writing structure, even if the results probably are significant. Otherwise, I would not recommend it for publication in journal article format.

1. **Language check-up:**

- Native English speaker and professional language editing and proofing recommended. I have noticed some spelling and grammar mistakes here and there in this manuscript.

1. **Title:**

- Spelling mistake "Shorelineevolution"; It seems to me two separate words if not on purpose.

- Avoiding area names (e.g., Morocco) in the title is recommended. This helps to increase its readability and citation.
- The number of words in the title is good. It is recommended to use 8 – 12 words in the title.

1. **Abstract:**

- The abstract is too short.
- The main results summary, methods used, novelty, and main results conclusions are missing.
- Some spelling mistakes were noticed, e.g., “ ...fulfilment....” in the first paragraph of the abstract.

1. **Keywords:**

- Keywords are a good number count; it is recommended to have about six keywords
- However, repeating words from the title in the keywords is not recommended because the aim of using keywords is to increase the searchability of the article.

1. **Introduction:**

- More text and refereeing are required here too.

1. **Materials and methods:**

- The materials and methods section should include the following sections
 - a. Description of the Study Area
 - b. Evaluation of the Impact of Dredging on the Coast of Larache
- Method sections require using a better scientific method than just an open Google Earth.

1. **Results:**

- Figures and tables appear without being explained and refereed in the text.
- Short results sentences are used without enough explanation of the results.

1. **Discussions:**

- The discussion section should include at least the following two sections.
 - a. Discussion of the Results Obtained
 - b. Discussion of the Results
- The discussion section is better than the other section which is written poorly, but more explanatory text can be added here too.

1. **Conclusions:**

- The conclusion was written very poorly. More results summary is required.
- No refereeing is used in conclusions usually. It should be based on your own work results.
- Even if the journal requires and allows refereeing, why have the references appeared at the beginning of the sentence?
- What are your contributions?
- What is the significance of your paper?
- What is the novelty of your paper?

1. **Figures:**

- Figures have appeared strangely without being referenced and explained in the text.

-

1. **Tables:**

- Tables have small size (e.g., 2 lines of results), result data, and appear strangely without being referenced and explained in the text.

-

1. **Bibliography:**

- This depends on the journal's refereeing style and its list format.