



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Astronomy and Astrophysics Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IAARJ_50780
Title of the Manuscript:	The swell dynamics and their implications over Africa: significance to climate change and forcing
Type of the 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	I find this manuscript of interest. It goes over the mechanisms that can generate swells and these can vary over time and places. In that sense, the manuscript is more a review paper rather than a research itself. Nothing wrong with that, but I think this fact should be reflected in the title; so, one recommendation is to change the title introducing the word "overview" or something similar. My other comment is that I am not sure if this is the right journal for this manuscript. It seems that the scope of this journal is deferent from the subject discuss in the paper. I think that the "Physical Science International Journal" is more appropriated for this paper. But that decision I leave it to the Editor. Regarding with the paper itself I recommend it for publication.	<i>I agree with reviewer's suggestion concerning the "manuscript sounds more a review than a research" and hence should be "reflected in the title". The revised version is now entitled "An overview of the swell dynamics and their implications over Africa: significance to climate change and forcing" Concerning the subject discussed in the paper, I hope the editor would help in addressing the issue, but I also agree with reviewer's suggestion above.</i>
Minor REVISION comments	In the manuscript I did some very minors changes (in red) as suggestion. I guess that for the final version, the editing of the equations will be improved.	<i>All the changes (and suggestions) have been captured in the manuscript. However, in section 7 (the last two paragraphs) still address African waves. Here the author wanted to highlight on other African waves and related studies. The author proposes a new subtitle "other African waves" (now section 8) so as to try deviate it from 'jet streams'. Conclusion now becomes section 9. These changes are highlighted in yellow. The word version used appears to distort the equations (and any other mathematical symbol/notations) when opened with the latest version. A pdf file is prepared for a better readability and identification. This is sent via email with the revised manuscript version in words format.</i>
Optional/General comments		<i>While the author agrees and with the reviewer (Fig. 6) that it would be nice to generate my own figure, I could not be able to redraw or edit this figure. However, I appreciate the reviewer's comment. Meanwhile, reference to the figure is captured, as reflected in the figure caption. This is the case with all other figures in the text, even from the web pages.</i>

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