

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_77564
Title of the Manuscript:	Rock Physics and Geo-Mechanical Analysis to enhance Sanding Prediction in Oil Wells in “Chi Field” Offshore Niger Delta.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Title and Abstract: The title is somewhat consistent with the search content, and the abstract is clear. However, the name of the study area must be highlighted in the abstract.- The UCS must be defined from its first appearance in the abstract, and then used only as an abbreviation in the rest of the text.- References section: - The author must add sufficient use sources published in the few past years.-The references in the last section of manuscript must be revised according to the journal rules.- Introduction: - The author must use the International System of Units (eg. m instead ft used in the last paragraph).- In page 3, the maps in figure 1 are not clear. They should be presented in large sizes, and with high resolution. The geological map misses the North arrow. The both maps should have the same geographical coordinate format and the same scale style.- Methods and Materials: The elastic and geomechanical parameters (Poisson ratio, Young modulus, Bulk modulus, Shear modulus, and UCS) must be discussed in this section using mathematical formulas.- The materials and the methodology used to explore information from the study area are missed, the author must present it.- In what year was the data collected? And are the data collected by the author himself or by an organisation ...? This point should be discussed in the materials section.- The CHI wells should be presented and discussed in this section.- Results and discussions: The figure Fig. 3a must be indicated only as Fig. 3 and Fig. 3b as Fig 4, same for Fig. 4a, Fig. 4b...etc- The lithostratigraphic Correlation and the Cross-plots of CHI Well12 are missed and not presented.- The table 1 should be interpreted using a short paragraph.- Conclusion: it is somewhat clear.	<p>In page 3, the geological map is the map of the studied field while the Niger Delta map is a schematic map showing a representation of Niger Delta. Therefore, geological coordinate is presented here.</p> <p>This was kept confidential and is not made available.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- We hope the author would find our recommendations helpful to revise this manuscript. Please see comments below.- Overall, the paper is not suitable for publication in the current form.- This paper has no line numbering which made the reviewer task challenging.- The paper needs some English revisions.	

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)	