

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_127628
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancing Sustainability Of Drilling Fluid: Coconut And Shea Butter Oils As Alternative To Diesel
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is scientifically relevant to researchers, oil industries and the general public, as it contains excellent scientific analysis of biomaterials for environmentally friendly drilling application. The originality of idea is good and there is clarity in communication. The methods used in the characterization of the samples are appropriate and scientific. The manuscript has scholarly quality and is scientifically robust. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript has adequate scientific correctness. The manuscript shows scientific comparison of the newly produced drilling fluid characterization with an already existing Diesel for better assessments and inferences. The technical content is clear, well detailed with specific analysis, and acceptable scientific defence. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript has scholarly quality The manuscript is acceptable as it is. 	

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:	Kate Oluchi Chike
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology Owerri, Nigeria