

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_97097
Title of the Manuscript:	Complete overview of reservoir characterization in sedimentary basins
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/editorial-policy>)

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)	1. The manuscript is general, but it is important for the scientific community 2. Complete panorama of the characterization of reservoirs in sedimentary basins (2 cases: anticline and fault structure) 3. added a paragraph explaining the petrography of reservoir rocks and the role of porosity on fluid circulation 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. The references are mostly recent The manuscript is partially well structured but I think it needs a case study	1. Thanks 2. True 3. Done 4. Thanks 5. Thanks 6. Thanks 7. No case study needed because it is a review paper not a research paper.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language of is well adapted but with rare minor corrections	Done
Optional/General comments	Some terms to replace Some figures changed and modified (contraste) Figures 3 and 4 have moved Figure 5 (enlarge text) Some changes in the text	Done

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	