

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_104716
Title of the Manuscript:	THE APPLICATION OF DEEP LEARNING IN PORE PRESSURE PREDICTION AND RESERVOIR OPTIMIZATION
Type of the Article	Minireview 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://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJOGER/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><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, I think the manuscript is of importance.</p> <p>Not quite sure. I am not sure this manuscript wants to concentrate on one/multiple applications or wants to have a general review. If it wants to have a general review, I recommend the title to be "A review of something".</p> <p>I will recommend the author to narrow the abstract's scope and concentrate on some more specific topics.</p> <p>Yes. There is no big issue.</p> <p>I believe that the manuscript is scientifically correct, but it is not comprehensive. The author should provide more details to prove it is correct.</p> <p>In general the references are good.</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>Yes. The language quality is good.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In general deep learning technique requires data set to train and test, and provides some statistic results such as confidence interval. If the author wants to concentrate on specific application, the author should mention the data set to train and test, and how the confidence interval is. If the manuscript wants to be a general review, I recommend that the author add some specific comparison over the traditional geophysical methods.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zhixin Zhao</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Geology, Chinese Academy of Geological Sciences, China</b>