

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_110919
Title of the Manuscript:	High Performance Aqueous Fluids in Deepwater Operation.
Type of the Article	Short Research 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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes 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>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes 		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please proofread the paper carefully, as there are several typographical and/or grammatical errors. 2. Abstract is too long. Please follow the word limitations (100-200 words). The abstract must contain: backgrounds (if any, maximum 2-3 sentences), short clear objectives, short methods, final results or findings, and conclusion. 3. The abstract is long and you used more general information. Please remove these information and put them in the introduction or any section in the manuscript. 4. You put the Tables and Figures in your manuscript but did not mention them in the sections. Please mention them in your manuscript. 5. The results for all Tables and Figures required more explanations, discussions and comparison with other studies is required. 6. Please indicate your results with other researchers that have the same behaviour in order to support your findings. 7. Compare the results for a previous studies to make your work more acceptable. 8. Conclusions should only answer the objectives of the research. Tells how your work advances the field from the present state of knowledge. Without clear Conclusions, reviewers and readers will find it difficult to judge the work, and whether or not it merits publication in the journal. Provide a clear scientific justification for your work, and indicate possible applications and extensions. 9. Please put a modern references in your manuscript. 10. In general, the manuscript need more arrangement, please rearrangement your manuscript. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Nabil Majd Alawi
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq