

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_109505
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of Conventional And Locally Sourced Surfactants For Enhancing Steam Flooding Techniques For Heavy Oil Recovery In Niger Delta
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. Yes, considering that it should include the comments we suggested throughout the document. 2. Yes 3. Yes, considering that it should include the comments we suggested in the abstract. 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes	 Noted Done revision Thanks
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. Yes	 Thanks
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is quite interesting for petroleum engineering studies, presenting a good review of the scientific literature applied to the study area, a comprehensible methodology, and a good description of the results. However, as we have indicated in the manuscript comments, there is one aspect of form and two aspects of substance that could enhance its overall quality. The aspect of form relates to the improved presentation of titles, their uniformity, and numbering throughout the manuscript. Titles of equal importance should receive the same emphasis in terms of font type, size, and logical numbering. As for the substantive aspects, it would be beneficial to address the suggestions provided in the comments throughout the manuscript. This includes the inclusion of comparative evidence from a real heavy oil recovery scenario for the purpose of comparison with the experiment conducted, if this is the intended message to be conveyed in the last sentence of the abstract. Additionally, it is important to substantiate the results and discussions with technical and/or scientific evidence. Merely presenting and analyzing the results without acceptable, achievable, and scientifically sound references is insufficient. Therefore, it is necessary to demonstrate whether the results meet the experimental criteria based on what?	 Noted

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	