The article contains theoretical and experimental investigation of generation of edge waves due to the parametric resonance in near-shore area.

The article is worth publishing after the Authors address points described below.

Incident wave field. As the wave maker did not have a system to damp waves reflected from the slope, the incident wave field ceased to be harmonic (and in fact predictable at all) a few seconds after the wave generation starts.
The whole flume is 18 metre length while only 1.25 m of it was in use.
Why have not authors installed the slope at the very end of the flume to bringing the travel time of the reflected wave (and hence the duration of the "clean" incident wave field) to above 20 seconds?
Can the authors comment on the influence of incident wave field irregularity on the results?

Stability threshold. Can the discrepancy in Fig. 8 be explained by formation of the edge waves near the panel of the wave maker? Can that effect be evaluated?

It looks as the use of the whole length of the wave flume mentioned above could have helped decoupling the edge waves formed at the slope and at those formed at the wave maker.

It would be good to compare the rate of edge wave growth (not only the stability range) with the results predicted by (10).

Turbulence. From the measurements, it would be good to calculate the Energy Dissipation Rate and compare it with other typical powers present in the system such as power pumped into various wave harmonics.

It would make a good illustration if the Authors present the power spectrum of the turbulent flow in log-log scale.

Minor points

P. 4, Line 18: probably, a cylindrical lens not spherical.

Fig. 5: Do markers easier to distinguish by making, say, diamonds empty and circles filled.

Fig. 6, caption: Turbulent Kinetic Energy not kinematic, right?

P. 6, line 10: "The frequency of the zero edge wave mode Omega_0 has a minimal dissipation"
The reviewer does not understand relation of that to the formula (11). Why dissipation?