

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_114578
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Upstream Oil and Gas Investment On Petroleum Production in Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The concept of manuscript is promising but the way manuscript is written it do not provide any concrete conclusion. Title is very generic; it should reflect methodology for readers feasibility. The abstract is very weak as it does not summarize the original concept of study. Subsections are structure is appropriate. The statistical approach is worth appreciations. References are very less and out of format. Authors are recommended to use uniform standards and formats for citations and bibliography. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The overall language of manuscript requires revision.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The title does not reflect the basic aim of the study which leaves readers with multiple curiosities, moreover after going through the manuscript the title looks irrelevant therefore title should be rewritten.</p> <p>The abstract of this study is very precise and do not cover any logical details of methodology, additionally no results or conclusions have been highlighted in abstract. The abstract must be improved.</p> <p>Authors must mention graphical plots of the outcomes from various tests.</p> <p>the author has incorporated Granger causality test but in outcomes no free or dependent variable from industry parameters have been mentioned which creates a huge gap in aim of the study and the outcomes, therefore it is recommended to either mention results based on free and independent variable or in methodology section specify what variables are under tests.</p> <p>The conclusion of the study does not provide any fruitful outcome for policy makers or oil industry investors thus the impact of this manuscript is negligible. Henceforth the conclusion section requires a serious interpretation-based improvements.</p> <p>The study shows high similarity index which is nonprofessional approach in scientific writing.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdul Haque Tunio
Department, University & Country	Institute of Petroleum & Natural Gas Engineering, Mehran University of Engineering & Technology, Pakistan