

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_80887
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnosing High Water Production in Kalama Field, Niger Delta
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are numerous grammatical errors in the text, and the text needs a through language proficiency before being published.2. It is better to use a table for defining the well characters in section 1.1. also it is recommended to add a figure of the well location in the field to this section.3. The Results and Discussion section is too short, and this section needs to improve and rich more.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I disagree with reviewer and if such exist, he should be more specific on the section where such is found and the authors will gladly correct any area(s) where such errors occur2. We disagree with reviewer. The description is lucid enough to guide readers about the Kalama field. The diagram of well location would have been provided by author's but because of confidentiality issues, we regret to add this to our paper.3. Unless the reviewer have further information necessary at the results and discussion section, the author's believe the section is rich enough to convey the true outcome of the investigation
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The number of references is low, and references are not new. Please add more and new references.2. Figure 2 is not required, cumulative production means time, so please remove figure 1 or 2. Also, figure 3 and 4 are not required, because you showed these plots in figure 5 together. Moreover, you made a mistake in numbering the figures.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Number of references improved with the addition of new references2. We thank the reviewer for these observations. However, Figures 1 and 2 are two different plots as cumulative production does not mean time. Figures 1 and 2 gives a clearer picture of total and instantaneous production. Figures 3 and 4 have been expunged as recommended by the reviewer and the mistake in the numbering of the figures corrected.
Optional/General comments	I would like to thank the authors for their valuable work to evaluate the water cut problem in the Kalama Field. I have left some comments, and I hope my comments help them to improve their paper.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	