

The present study utilizes SWAN model to study the impact of dredging on the hydrodynamic in the Oued Sebou estuary. Different case studies are carried out to do the sensitive analysis. two locations at different depths are selected to study the impact in the wave parameters near the estuary. The flow of information in the paper is very smooth defining each aspect very briefly. The authors have discussed every test cases with proper detailed explanation. The conclusions are well written. This paper forms a good piece of information related to dredging activities as it will be beneficial to the coastal communities. It may be accepted for publication with major revision.

Following points may be considered for review:

1. Language should be checked thoroughly at many places throughout the manuscript especially grammar.
2. Abstract: Introductory lines in starting of abstract can be reduced. Significant results obtained from the study can be included in 1-2 lines.
3. Ln98: Avoid repetition of the citation.
4. Ln112: define the model version number. Give reference
5. Figure 3 caption can be reframed. Instead of 'Meshing' use 'Mesh used'
6. Ln 204: Mention the parameters. If the data is measured data then the accuracy is correct. How this statement is applicable here? If study is using any reanalysed data then the accuracy of the data has to be assessed and it has to be validated with the measured data. The sentence can be deleted or reframed w.r.t content.
7. Ln206-212: Give rose plots for wind data with seasons as explained in this para. It will give better understanding for readers.
8. Ln 213: Specify the data. Also mark the weather station in the study region/bathymetry figure. Also give duration of the data used. Any previous studies describing winds in this region? If yes please cite them.
9. Ln 216-220: Explain Figure 4 in more details in regards with wave height (seas and swells) and periods. Also use constant values of direction in the rose plots instead of giving range as the area has one dominant direction, so giving range for each quadrant is of no use. Also specify direction for each 4 quadrants. It is easy to understand for readers.
10. Ln 218-219: This statement is not clear. Are these initial conditions or boundary values? Whether SWAN model was setup using wind input for whole duration of the study? Be specific with this details.
11. Ln 224: Expand 'NGM'
12. Table 1: units are missing
13. Ln 231-232: Does it mean that the dominant wave direction is west/northwest? If not then specify the dominant wave direction.
14. Ln 235-237: These lines can be shifted to last para of Introduction as this section discusses various inputs given to the model.
15. Ln 242: specify what are the wave types considered in this study.

16. Ln 248: what are the total inputs given to the model? What are other physics used in model setup? Whether winds were given. It is better to rename this section as model setup and write all the details more clearly.
17. Table 2: Put significant wave height as first column and period as second column as in further discussion authors have followed this sequence. Expand T_{pic} in the text. Peak period is usually denoted as T_p .
18. Section 5: Rename as Results and Discussion.
19. In all figures increase the font size. Values are not visible.
20. Ln 293 –in this paragraph author has suddenly discussed about relative current velocity distribution. Nowhere in the manuscript is mentioned about this.
21. Ln 301:How do the authors gets this output (bottom current velocity)? SWAN model will give wave parameter and spectra. Authors may specify details about the same in methodology. Also authors should be specific about the velocities, do they refer it to velocity components? as the values are in negative it cannot be current speed. Also why current directions are not discussed?
22. In fig 11, zone A we see negative variation in Case 4. Justify that variation.
23. Conclusions: Ln 369: About sand extraction can also be mentioned in initial part of the manuscript.
24. Ln 379-381: This is also mentioned first time in conclusions. Link it somewhere in results and discussion.