

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_106878
Title of the Manuscript:	Direct Hydrocarbon Indicator Pitfall and Sand Development in Deepwater Environment - A Case Study of 'Oyo-Dw' Field Niger Delta, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript presents a useful study using DHI as a tool to decipher sands in the offshore environment and can be a good addition to the scientific community interested in the related topics. 2. It is better to revise the title as: Sand development and direct hydrocarbon indicator (DHI) analysis in deep water environment: A case study of "Oyo-Dw" Field, Niger Delta, Nigeria. 3. The abstract requires some revision. The authors should rearrange the abstract introducing the use of DHI followed by brief research methods they used and finally results and conclusions of their work. This could be followed by recommendations. Overall abstract is OK, only rearrangement of sentences is required. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5. Yes. 6. Yes. <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Materials and Methodology: the second paragraph should be shifted to Results and Discussion as it is general stratigraphic information and not methodology. Please elaborate the method how well to seismic tie was carried out and how amplitude extraction/ depth map generation was done. • The authors have mentioned biostratigraphy data in materials and methodology, however, I don't see any biostratigraphic analysis. It better to either omit this word from materials and methodology section or add some biostratigraphic analysis. • In Results and Discussion: Please add/cite the Figure number for major reservoir units. • In Results and Discussion: It is better to remove the second paragraph (starting from "The Tertiary reservoirs of the Niger delta during the falling limb of relative sea level change") as it appears to be a repetition of the same information already described in the Introduction. • The first sentence of the conclusions should be rewritten considering language correction. • Please mention the year with reference to Mike Forest in conclusions i.e., Mike Forest (2010). Also, spell check in both conclusions and references, is it Forest or Forrest? • In Fig. 7, Please add the direction of seismic lines, i.e., W, E, N and/ or S. Please also remove the pink small boxes on top of the seismic section as they don't show anything. • In Figure 12, it would be better to provide the well correlation having a somewhat higher resolution for better view and clarity. • The authors should add a bullet or two about the DHI in the conclusions as well, since the paper is based on it. For example, what is the significance of DHI observed at various levels/ horizons in this study, the occurrence of flat spots/events etc.? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The English language needs proofreading and minor grammatical/ typo corrections before publication. One frequent typo is full stop should be after the cited reference or Figure number in a sentence, please correct it throughout the manuscript text. Some of the minor typo are highlighted with Yellow in the attached manuscript for quick view. Some sentences are repetition and should be removed marked with Strikethrough in attached manuscript. 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Natasha Khan
Department, University & Country	Abbottabad University of Science and Technology, Pakistan