

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_102874
Title of the Manuscript:	Lithostratigraphic Characterization and Petroleum System Elements of the MI Well, Niger Delta Basin
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It has certain scientific significance</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. the abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but there are still many problems.</p> <p>6. The references are basically OK.</p> <p>Some suggestions:</p> <p>1.The four lithofacies units: sandstone, shale, sandy shale, and shaly sand, given by the manuscript are not a lithofacies but a lithology.</p> <p>2.Parts 1 and 2 are lengthy and need to be simplified.</p> <p>3.Please give the definition of lithozone. Are the 49 lithozones duplicated or similar? Is it better to summarize and describe by category?</p> <p>4.The description of reservoir, cap and source rock in this paper is mainly based on lithology.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>language/English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications, however there are some terms that are not used properly..</p> <p>1.What's the meaning of lithozone?</p> <p>2.What's the meaning of depobelts?</p> <p>3.The term Tertiary is no longer used; the Paleogene and Neogene are now used.</p> <p>4.The title of Figure 1 does not convey the picture clearly.</p> <p>5.Figure 3 shows too little and can be merged with Figure 1.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[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:	Dongdong Wang
Department, University & Country	Shandong University of Science and Technology, China