

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_89270
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Local Clays from Edo and Delta State as feedstock in drilling fluid formulation
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> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The general subject of the study entitled "<b>Evaluation of Local Clays from Edo and Delta State as feedstock in drilling fluid formulation</b>" with Ref. (Ms_JERR_89270) is interesting and has valuable information. However, to improve the quality of this article, the following comments should be considered. After making the following minor corrections, the article will be acceptable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recast the first sentence of the abstract to capture/include "Oyede," being the location from which the fourth clay sample was collected.</li> <li>2. In the abstract, include the additives used in parenthesis. For instance, ".....the drilling mud was formulated with some additives (carboxyl methyl cellulose, CMC, Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>, NaOH, etc)"</li> <li>3. The keywords should appear in alphabetical order, and also maintain a uniform format (that's all initials in upper or lower case).</li> <li>4. Ensure that the first paragraph of the introduction has uniform font size and also enrich with recent literature studies from 2010 till date.</li> <li>5. In section 2.2, cite the author(s) whose method(s) was/were employed. Also correct grammatical errors.</li> <li>6. Recast the last sentence in section 2.2 ( Similarly, 0.5g, 1.0g, 1.5g, 2.0g, 2.5g and 3.0g of additives (barite, NaOH, and sodium carboxyl methyl cellulose, the mud was formulated by addition of 21grams clay and 350 ml distilled water) to make a scientific sense.</li> <li>7. Ensure that you cite the authors whose methods were employed from sections 2.3.1 to 2.3.5, and that the cited authors appear in the reference list.</li> <li>8. In section 2.3.3, change Mud Rheological to Mud Viscosity Test, and use accordingly in other places.</li> <li>9. In section 2.3.3, number the three equations and cite the authors whose equations were used. E.g. <math>AV = \theta 600rpm/2</math> [1]</li> <li>10. State the full meaning of every abbreviation where it first appeared.</li> <li>11. In section 3.1, cite all API Standard data used and ensure they appear in the reference list. E.g. ....while other values were low when compared with API Specification (API, 2010) which is between 9.5 – 12.5 as shown in figure 1.</li> <li>12. There is no section 3.3.</li> <li>13. Give a justification for including only the results of Fluid Loss for Afuze and Ipkeshi muds, and for excluding those of Ogwashi-Ukwu and Oyede muds in section 3.10. This can appear as part of the conclusion</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Azinta Cyprian Obinna</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT), Nigeria</b>