

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_97140
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhanced hydrocarbon recovery using the application of seismic attributes in fault detection and direct hydrocarbon indicator in Tomboy Field, western-Offshore Niger Delta Basin
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Compulsory Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The manuscript exposed to a good scientific community 2) The title of the article is suitable 3) The abstract are not comprehensive and should be revised according to the structure below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction - Problem and objective - Method - Result - Conclusion 4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5) The manuscript is scientifically correct 6) Most of the references are obsolete 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language quality of the article is moderately suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Kindly update the references as the majority of your references are out of date	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Syamsul Imran Zaini
Department, University & Country	College of Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia