

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_120677
Title of the Manuscript:	Reservoir Management Structure A Field "RK" Using Water Injection Project Planning With Suspended Well Reactivation Method
Type of the 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of the article is novel and worthy of in-depth analysis. The conception of the author 's behavior is relatively rigorous. Therefore, this article is worth further revision and publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The topic should highlight the research focus of this paper.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The content of the abstract is not comprehensive enough, please adjust it appropriately.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The content of this paper is less as a whole, and the numerical simulation and analysis are not sufficient. The author is requested to further describe the research content, so as to improve the readability of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Not seen.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language fluency.	
Optional/General comments	It is suggested that the author supplement the volume of the article and enrich it.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Liang Yuehui
Department, University & Country	Anhui University of Science & Technology, China