

Dear Dr Shugan,

The scientific issues raised by the referees have been mostly resolved and although I have some residual reservations I will not raise them now. The remaining hurdle is not scientific, the manuscript needs a massive editorial effort to make it accessible to readers.

I cannot commit myself to such a task, you need help of either a native English speaker colleague or a professional editor.

To give you an idea what is required let us go through the beginning of the manuscript.

The title: “Dynamical resonance model for Benjamin-Feir instability of waves in the presence of current” has to be changed. It does not provide a clear idea what it is all about. The words “*Dynamical resonance model*” I am afraid are incomprehensible. The words “*in the presence of current*” are too vague. “waves” have not been specified, wave is a generic term. What are the main elements of your work: three mode model of BF instability, water waves, deep water, non-uniform unidirectional current. The title should reflect all this and be understandable concise. I would suggest smth like “**An analytical model of the evolution of a Stokes wave and its two Benjamin-Feir sidebands on nonuniform unidirectional current**”. You can omit analytical if you wish.

Abstract: The first sentence “*The development of Benjamin-Feir instability of Stokes waves in the presence of variable current is presented.*” The development of anything cannot be presented. A study or a model - can. The sentence should convey the essence of the work and contain the key words, it does not. I could suggest, for example, as an option: **An analytical weakly nonlinear model of Benjamin-Feir instability of a Stokes wave on nonuniform unidirectional current is presented.**

Second sentence “We employ a model of a resonance system having three coexisting nonlinear waves and nonuniform current.” This sentence should convey the key assumptions or/and specific features of the model. Again, it does not. I would suggest: **The model describes evolution of a Stokes wave and its two main sidebands propagating on a slowly varying nonuniform unidirectional steady current. In contrast to the models based on versions of the cubic Sch-r equation the current variations could be strong, which allows us to examine the blockage and consider substantial variations of the wave numbers and frequencies of interacting waves.**

I think that before jumping to the results it would be desirable to have a couple of sentences about your assumptions and explain what you are doing. In fact what you doing is very simple and could be easily explained before presenting the results. You are using standard weakly nonlinear equations describing a Stokes wave and its two resonantly coupled sidebands. The effect of nonuniform current (in the abstract you have to specify the scale of nonuniformity) apart from linear transformation described by the conservation of wave action is in the detuning of the resonant interactions, which strongly affects the nonlinear evolution of the system.

The rest of the abstract is OK, except the words “resonance model”. These words should be avoided in the abstract and the rest of the manuscript. On having specified your model in the first sentences you can later to say just “the model”.

l.42: Again “wave resonance”: it is not clear. You have to explain it once.

l44-48: I would suggest to delete these lines.

l66: “long-scale current”, the use of the term is wrong throughout the manuscript. Here you mean slowly-varying current.

l94: The use of the word “gradual” is incorrect throughout the manuscript. Here is better to use “small”.

l133: The sentence is incomprehensible.

L195: The use of “zero-dimensional” is incorrect here and throughout the manuscript. Probably your intention was to say that this is the zero-order approximation. If my guess is correct, then you should specify that your solution is sought as an asymptotic expansion in powers of epsilon and this is the zero (or first ?) order equations.

Hope it is now clear what is expected from your side. Although my editorial decision reads “*Minor Revision*”, it requires a substantial work. Hope to see the manuscript soon ready for publication.

Sincerely,

Victor Shrira