

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_85148
Title of the Manuscript:	QUANTITATIVE INTERPRETATION OF PETROPHYSICAL PARAMETERS FOR RESERVOIR CHARACTERIZATION IN AN ONSHORE FIELD OF NIGER DELTA BASIN
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:

(<https://www.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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	<p>1) Introduction is disordered and aimless. Authors just simply list lows of literature reviews. However, the important information, such as innovations, focused issues, methods, and value of this article, are missing or oversimplified. It is necessary to rewrite the introduction. The literature review has been how written that leads to misunderstanding.</p> <p>3) Submit a relevant graphical abstract or schematic of the research approach; this may enhance the impact of your paper.</p> <p>4) The innovation and the importance of this work are not clearly highlighted in the abstract, introduction, and conclusions. Please work on this and prove to us why this work is valuable.</p> <p>5) A comparative study has been done in figure 13, however, is not enough and needs to more details. It is recommended to provide a general description for each system in a separate section.</p> <p>6) A few more citations to the most recent papers would help clarify the position of this manuscript. to improve the quality, the following recommendations can be incorporated.</p> <p>"Improved oil recovery by the efficiency of nano-particle in imbibition mechanism." In 2nd EAGE international conference KazGeo, pp. cp-315. European Association of Geoscientists & Engineers, 2012.</p> <p>"Mechanisms behind injecting the combination of nano-clay particles and polymer solution for enhanced oil recovery." Applied Nanoscience 6, no. 6 (2016): 923-931.</p> <p>7) Compare your results with others from the literature and discuss them. Give more detailed information for the validation procedures. All the figures and the tables have to be explained in more detail by comparing with similar papers.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The comments in yellow colour seem not related to the paper, probably the reviewer missed the comment with other papers, basically looking at the recommended references in s/n 6, these paper have not correlation with our paper.2. The Figure 13 mention is not a comparative analysis but a continuation of the previous diagram Figure 12 - 14
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) The manuscript needs a thorough revision on its language and style. Overall, this paper is very difficult to read. Avoid redundancies and keep it short. I suggest a thoroughly overhaul of the text for a more clearly understanding towards the reader.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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)	