



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_50644
Title of the Manuscript:	Palynological and paleobotanic characterization of upper Eocene-lower Miocene deposits of the southeastern part of the onshore sedimentary basin of Côte d'Ivoire
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://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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Dear editor,</p> <p>In their manuscript, the authors describe a palynoflora recovered from a section of two wells drilled in Côte d'Ivoire Basin. They provide important information regarding the palynomorphs of Upper Eocene-Lower Miocene in age. Additionally give some paleobotanic and lithologic data. It is an interesting paper showing multidisciplinary information concerning the Côte d'Ivoire Basin. Also, discuss and make correlations with other palynomorphs-guide occurring in Venezuela and others African countries. Consequently, the MS provides interesting new data that deserves publication in the Asian Journal of Geological Research.</p> <p>However, I would like to remark some minor points for further improvement of the work. There are some minor errors that are pointed out in the ms.</p> <p>In the Discussion should be include some comparisons with the species and range of the palynomorphs-guide present in the Brazilian marginal basins that have important section of this age.</p> <p>The conclusions regarding the lithology are very weakly and deserve a better explanation about the meaning of the lithology in terms of environment.</p> <p>My comments can be entirely shown to the authors.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Luzia Antonioli</p>	<p>I took into account suggestions and corrections proposed.</p> <p>Regarding the discussion I could not make comparisons with the species and the range of palynomorphs present in the Brazilian marginal basins as you suggested to me.</p> <p>All my research on the internet did not allow me to have these informations.</p> <p>Thanks for the relevant remarks</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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript