

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_84774
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical Assessment of the Impact of Sand Control Techniques on Production in a Vertical Well
Type of the 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.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper is well written and worthy of publishing, the following are suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In Figure 1 and Figure 2, as the text fonts are too small, the text can be shown as a separate part</li><li>• Figure numbering are wrong.</li><li>• Figures 3 4 and on wards need editing. E.g; axes lines etc..axes values etc...</li><li>• The headings and sub headings are too long, try simplifying them.</li><li>• Improve the literature...</li><li>• Add some publications for example: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joes.2019.07.001">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joes.2019.07.001</a></li><li>• <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2021.109173">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2021.109173</a></li><li>• <a href="https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9012496">https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9012496</a></li></ul> <p>-Figures and graphs need strong improvement Provide a list of abbreviation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I have increased the size of the Figure 1 and 2 which makes the fonts bigger and more readable</li><li>• I have corrected the Figure numbering. Figure 4 was repeated but I have changed it to Figure 5</li><li>• The Figures 3, 4 and on wards have been edited. The axis lines and values have been clearly indicated</li><li>• The headings and sub headings have been considerably edited</li><li>• The cited literatures in the works have been selectively chosen as being most relevant. Your suggested literatures are not so relevant for this work.</li><li>• Nomenclature have been added (list of abbreviations) and the quality of the figures slightly enhanced.</li></ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Formatting is not properly done</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Formatting was based on the provided journal template</li></ul>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[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>	I have effected all the pointed corrections. I have only highlighted the texts and not the Figures.