Summarize the main results of the article in a few sentences:

In this article, they are interested to relate whale trajectory patterns to the presence and propagation of noise due to ship activities. With their method they show what is the noise intensity and its direction, receiving by a whale at a given position. Nevertheless, they didn't see a specific whale behavior as a response of avoiding ambient noises.

Answer the following questions about the structure of the paper:

Overall content:

1. Is the overall purpose of the study and /or central question clear?
   Yes, they seek to establish a relation between anthropogenic noise in ocean and whale trajectories.

2. Does the interpretation of the findings answer the overall question of the paper?

   Due to a lack of data they didn't succeed to relate whale trajectory patterns to ship noise. But they give an approximation of the ambient noise.

3. Is every paragraph and sentence in the paper relevant to the overall question?

   Yes.

   If no, point to some examples:

4. Are there portions of the text that could be omitted?

   In the Methods part an equation is given with no explanation. This one can be omitted.

5. Is the overall organization of the paper clear and effective?

   Everything in this article is clear and well organized. The article's structure makes enjoyable reading.

Individual sections:

1. Does the title adequately represent the content of the paper?
   Yes, absolutely.

   Suggestions for improvement: (maybe too long but it 's okay)

2. Does the abstract clearly and concisely summarize the paper and state the main results? Does is contain all needed information (context, need, task, object, findings and conclusion)?

   The abstract is well written and summarize all the different part of the article. It doesn't contain the findings and do not mention the main results of this study.

3. Does the introduction provide enough context to the readers? Does it state the need for the work? Does it state clearly what has been done to address it?

   I found the introduction giving enough context to understand what is the problematic and what they need for their study. The last paragraph in the introduction gives us what is the main purpose of their work and how they proceed to go through.

4. Does this paper put the progress it reports in the context of existing published work? Is there adequate referencing and introductory discussion?

   At different parts of this article, they used existing models (as Ross) and data provided by other organizations, and they always cited and referred them.

5. Are the material and methods used in the study clearly explained? Can you point out what is special, unexpected, or different in the approach compared to existing published work? Does it contain too many technical details?

   The Methods part is well structured, with three subsections. All of them describe very clearly what is achieved with data and how. However, I found the part about the TL computation a bit fuzzy and hard to get it, due to a lack of explanation on how TL is retrieved by the numerical model. But it's also a technical point that doesn't prevent to understand the rest of the article.

6. Is the results sections(s) clearly and concisely written? Are there logical and smooth transitions between sections, subsections and between paragraphs?

The results part is also well organized with is a short introduction paragraph and two subsections, which is great to make things clear.

7. Does the conclusion clearly state the most important outcome of the work? Does it address the questions stated in the Introduction? Does the conclusion just summarize the results or does it interpret the findings and explain what they mean?

The conclusion state all the different outcomes of the work and show all the different uncertainties and limitations. It is a conclusion/discussion part. It has also a paragraph about the importance of such studies.

8. Are the interpretations and conclusions adequately supported by the evidence presented? That is, are the assumptions valid, is the methodology sound, is the evidence adequate, and do the conclusions logically follow?

Yes, all the main results are discussed and criticized. The conclusion is logical and tends to give some clues to investigate in a future work.

9. Are all parts of the text, references, graphics and tables necessary for the new results and main points to be understood?

Yes, the text presents concisely each result and refers to the proper figure, which lead to get the main idea clear.

10. Are the graphics and tables clear and their captions self-explanatory?

In my point of view, in figure 1, I will zoom-in more on the fin whale trajectory area. Otherwise, all figures are well labeled and have good captions.

- **Sentences and Wording**

  1. Can you find grammatical mistakes?

     I found nothing but I am not an English teacher.

  2. Can you point to sentences that loose you (too long/complex) and do you have suggestions for improvement?

     Nop, everything is written in an easy way in this article.

  3. Are generally the action in verbs, characters in subjects and subjects near verbs? Can you find counter-examples? Can you point out misused nominalizations?

     Yes. No. Generally, this article uses short sentences that avoid to get confused.

  4. Is the writing cohesive? Does it flow well? Is the part of the sentence that links to the previous sentence at the beginning or the end?

     Yes.

  5. Are the paragraphs coherent? Do the first and last sentences of paragraphs match? Can you find counter-examples?

     Yes, each have a first catchy sentence with the main idea of the paragraph and the rest that follows describes it.

  6. Is there an abusive use of passive voice?

     No.

7. Can you find a lot of useless words/phrases?

   Yes, sometimes some sentences start with "Also", "However" or even "As we have seen before…".

8. Can you find complex words that could be replaced by simpler ones?

   I only found anthropogenic which can be defined at its first use or replace by human activity.

9. Can you find too complex subjects?

   I found the modeling shipping noise a bit hard to understand. It requires more technical explanation on what they do.

10. Can you find inadequately used adverbs/ repetition/ excessive hedging?

    No.

11. Is the use of tenses (past/present/future) adequate?

    Absolutely, yes.

- **Other comments?**