



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_50161
Title of the Manuscript:	Reservoir Geometry Determination and Volumetric Reserve Estimation of an Offshore, Niger Delta Basin Nigeria
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Overall Judgment and comments</p> <p>I appreciate very much the great effort you put in the current work. But in this stage, The paper focuses on the idea that is traditional and well known and has been published in much more journals. Rewrite the paper to tell the case history. I believe you need to more effort to reorganize your manuscript to fit a scientific research paper. There are many paragraphs written to describe the technical work of production .This should be very much concise and put in method section in the introduction. You need to reorganize the manuscript into the known sections, A good abstract should include " Problem" , " Objectives" ,methods" ,Results and Discussion". I have made many suggestions that I believe could improve the quality of the present manuscript.</p> <p>This work represents a good Review article for Proper understanding of the underlying geology helps to accurately predict the hydrocarbon potentials and reserves estimation of a petroleum field using data from cores, seismic, well logs and biostratigraphic data. The main objective of the study is to identify and to resolve this underlying geology and thus aid in characterizing the hydrocarbon reservoir. Another goal of this study is to integrate petrophysical data with geological and engineering data to accurately predict reservoir quality in Idje oil field and relating the petrophysical and structural tectonics of the Niger Delta , Nigeria.</p>	The manuscript has been modified
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please check all comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- A good abstract should be cover the identification of problem , experiments/observation , Conclusions). The abstract should be concise and reflecting the article. The authors are suggested to rewrite the abstract 2- The introduction of the research paper is very general. Already published research on the study area should be incorporated in summarized form. Also include the research gap with the already published research. Similarly, the aims and objectives of the present research should be mentioned at the end of introduction section.The introduction should cover the following items : Review history of the study area, Problem and objectives , Aim of the study , Data utilizes and methods . 3- The methodology should be described in detail with certain standard steps. This section should be concise and needs to be squeezed. 4- Geologic setting of the Niger Delta and the Study area should be rewrite and you can support this section stratigraphic column and regional tectonics. 5- Some typing errors must be corrected in the manuscript such as spaces in the beginning of each paragraph, capital and small letters in the beginning of some words... etc. 6- Merge the two figures (Figs. 1 and 2), put latitudes and longitudes, and scale on all maps. This is necessary. 7- Arrange the references alphabetically, and add more recent references. Besides, some references are missing. 8- Figs. 3,4,5,7, and 8 are not mentioned in the text. These figure must be explained 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>in the discussion of results.</p> <p>9- All mentioned equations need references and number them.</p> <p>10- The Formation and depositional environments section (1.3) is too long, it should be reduced.</p> <p>11- The materials and methods section (2) is too long, it should be reduced, and put references for the tool theory.</p> <p>12- The discussion of results is too short, you must rewrite it.</p> <p>13- Review the description of maps. All maps are not clear and need to redraw.</p> <p>14- The authors are requested to consult latest research of similar kind. The paper should be improved and the authors should support their results using photographs, tables, charts.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment <u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>This manuscript is more or less good , but the writing style is non-academic. The manuscript is not reasonably of broad interest and lacks internationalism. I cannot find any novelty in this paper. I recommend to publish this paper in Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International and therefore the authors need further improvement of the manuscript. I believe could improve the quality of the present manuscript.</p> <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this work.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	