

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_102874</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Lithostratigraphic Characterization and Petroleum System Elements of the MI Well, Niger Delta Basin</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>NO (See the reviews comment )</p> <p>YES</p> <p>NO (See the reviews comment )</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>NO (See the reviews comment )</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>All the mentioned reviews comments must be considered before acceptance for publication.</p> <p>1- Shown in ( bold red colours in the original attached manuscript )</p> <p>2- Remarks , shown in ( bold blue colours in the original attached manuscript )</p> <p>2-1 Conclusion subsection was given no. 4 , instead of no. 5</p> <p>2-2 Ref . no. 29 was mentioned in the text , but was absent in the references list , given at the end of the manuscript.</p> <p>2-3 - Figs. no 1-3 , may be enlarged in the text , so that information can be well demonstrated.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohammed Eldaghmah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Naif Arab University for Security Sciences, Saudi Arabia</b>