Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Energy Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JENRR_115813**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Investigating the Impact of Wash Water Pump Rate on the Efficiency of Desalting Process, a Case Study of X-Field in Iraq**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**The manuscript addresses a significant practical concern within the oil industry. Its practical focus and empirical findings make it potentially valuable for the scientific community. It could contribute to improving operational efficiency and mitigating risks associated with salt-related issues in crude oil refining.** **Investigating the Impact of Wash Water Pump Rate on the Efficiency of Desalting Process of Crude Oil, a Case Study of X-Field in Iraq** **Yes** **Yes** **Yes** **No**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Some grammatical errors and awkward phrasing detract slightly from the overall readability of the manuscript. **Minor** revisions are needed to ensure clarity and coherence, particularly in the abstract, introduction and conclusions sections.	
Optional/General comments	• Literature in the introduction part is length, make it short and concise accordingly. • Use the technical words in the manuscript. • Replace remnant with residual. • Vapour with vapor. • m3/hr with m^3/hr • Add the heading study area in the manuscript. • Add Methodology heading Just before the equipment's details. • No need of Figure 1 and Figure 3, provide short description only. • Figure 2 and Figure 4 are important but not clear. Increase the Fig size and resolution. • The results are on weekly basis for ten months as described in abstract, but in results it showed the results up to 10 weeks instead of 40 weeks. Check x axis timeframe in figures, It would be time in months instead of time in weeks. • Captions of Figures (5 to 9) should be revised to make it specific as timeframe vs salinity at ……..maximum efficiency and accordingly for remaining Figures. • Briefly discuss the results for Figure 5 to Figure 13 and validate with references. • The conclusions lack significance and are overshadowed by the methodology discussion. Please revise and focus on key findings only to enhance effectiveness. • The literature review (in introduction) and references section require expansion, incorporating recent references from 2022 to 2024, to strengthen the scholarly foundation of the article.	

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Abdul Haque Tunio**
Department, University & Country	**Mehran University of Engineering & Technology, Pakistan**