Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_110010**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Hydrate Control in Subsea Natural Gas Production**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes, the hydrate formation is, and was a permanent problem in my carrier. We used methanol, as it was mentioned in the article.** **Yes this is suitable, maybe I should add some secondary title too.** **Yes, it is.** **Yes, but the chapter 3, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS do not reflect all the achieved result defined in the 1.4 SCOPE OF STUDY.** **Yes, but this is more technological than scientific article.** **We can find a few references in the text. It is quite impossible to recognize, which are the original part, coming from the author and which are those coming from the references. This need to be completed.** **The Figure 2 and Figure 3 are incorrect. It represent the data from Table 5 and 6. If we check the data points there is a big lack of data between 2000m and 118900m. In such case it is not indicated to fit a curve along these points. The linear regression for the left part points for the temperature, has a different steepness (tangent= 0.0013) versus the right points regression line (tangent=0,0001). As a consequence, the lack of data exists for pressure parameter too, for the mentioned segment. These need to be handled.** **What are good for these tables and diagrams? The author mentions that the hydrates used to form over 100bar, which falls in the segment without P, T data.** **A P-T diagram should also help the reader for a better understanding the formation of hydrates. In my view the P-T parameters need to be regulated in order to have a "flow assurance" out of the Hydrate Stability Zone (HSZ). A third parameter is the amount of water, which will shift this HSZ. This can't be influenced, only by additional separators along the pipeline. The delicate regulation of the P - T parameters – together with MEG will reduce the hydrate generation.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes it is!	
Optional/General comments	The explanation for Table 3, 5 and 6 are missing from the text.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Zoltán Unger**
Department, University & Country	**ELTE, Hungary**