

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. This manuscript is important for scientific community because it is a review of main techniques of hydrocarbon exploration and production 2. No. I suggest just <u>reservoir characterization review in sedimentary basins</u> 3. the abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. I suggest to the authors to reconsider the structure of this manuscript 5. The MS is scientifically correct but needs some minor revisions throughout the text 6. The references are good	 1. Thanks 2. Done 3. Thanks 4. Done 5. Done 6. Thanks
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think yes, but with some errors. I suggest to see my comments	Already done. Fixed!
Optional/General comments		

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)	