

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Reviewer's Comments: The presentation lacks of depth on the preparation of surfactants from local material, Paw-paw leaf extract. 1. The way of writing and grammar need to be considered, for references format must follow standard rules, references should be taken in the last five years about 60-70 percent of the total number of references cited. 2. The appearance of tables and figures should be kept as simple as possible 3. The writing sequence scheme for each chapter should be improved to make it more organized and more neat. 4. Specifically in the manufacture of surfactant from paw-paw leaf extract, is there no initial synthesis and characterization of the surfactant formulation? So that it can be said that the material is included in the surfactant category, for example, Hydrophilic Lyphophilic Balance (HLB), CMC, etc. measurements. 5. IFT is important for the EOR and test phase behavior, did you conduct this analysis?	Noted Effected revision Noted and amended Done
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

[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)	