

Paper: “Spatio-Temporal Assessment of Shoreline Changes and Management of the Transgressive Mud Coast, Nigeria”

Submitted: 05 April 2022

Accepted: 18 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Olusola Popoola

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p99](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p99)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Satish Kumar
Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia

Reviewer 2: Suleiman Abdul-Azeez Adegboyega
Department of Remote Sensing and GIS, School of Earth and Mineral Sciences,
Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Clear title but can be improved if required, as suggested , in order to make the title attractive

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear and specific, relevant to the content and context

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Minor grammatical errors. Good flow of sentences and ease of understanding.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methodology is clearly explained

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The graphs could be enhanced so that the variations in shoreline over a period of 35 years could be clear and visible

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate. Requires slight modification

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Interesting study using DSAS in identifying shoreline retreat

Reviewer O:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title aligns with the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, except that the author needs to state specifically, the multi spectral images and elevation models utilized for the study.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Minimal but the author should be consistent with the rules of et al citation.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are clearly explained but a few numbers of technical issues raised should be addressed by the author.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Proofreading is highly necessary as punctuation errors are observed.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate and aligned with the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

All citations are properly listed under the reference section.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author should proofread the reviewed manuscript as some observations have been tracked in the manuscript for necessary corrections.

Reviewer P:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Something seems to be missing from the title "Spatiotemporal assessment for shoreline management of the Transgressive Mud Coast, Nigeria". Spatio-temporal assessment of what? Of shoreline changes? The author need to provide the answer.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract captures the study objective as well as the methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, a very few grammatical errors exist which the author need to correct.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods were well-explained. However, it is important for the author to carry out a thorough literature review of past work in the area. For instance, nothing was mentioned on flooding events in the study area or factor responsible until the concluding part of the manuscript. The author needs to provide further information on the study area characteristics in terms of flooding events and the dominant factor responsible, nature of sediment, river inlets/ estuaries in the study area. These background information are necessary for the prospective readers to appreciate the present findings.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The results and discussion were okay, except that some background information on which they supposed to be built on is missing.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Some information were provided in the conclusion which were never previously mentioned.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References relating to coastal flooding (a by-product of sea level rise) and dominating factors in the study area are missing.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the attached for my remark. Also, something seems to be missing from the title "Spatiotemporal assessment for shoreline management of the Transgressive Mud Coast, Nigeria". Spatio-temporal assessment of what? Of shoreline changes? The author need to provide the answer.
