

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_97097
Title of the Manuscript:	Complete overview of reservoir characterization in sedimentary basins
Type of the Article	Review 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.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> <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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is general, but it is important for the scientific community</p> <p>2. Complete panorama of the characterization of reservoirs in sedimentary basins (2 cases: anticline and fault structure)</p> <p>3. added a paragraph explaining the petrography of reservoir rocks and the role of porosity on fluid circulation</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references are mostly recent</p> <p>The manuscript is partially well structured but I think it needs a case study</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The quality of the English language of is well adapted but with rare minor corrections	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some terms to replace</p> <p>Some figures changed and modified (contraste)</p> <p>Figures 3 and 4 have moved</p> <p>Figure 5 (enlarge text)</p> <p>Some changes in the text</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abbache Abdelkader
Department, University & Country	Mustapha Stambouli University of Mascara, Algeria