

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	

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.	Although oil-based drilling fluids offer advantages such as well stability, lubrication and temperature resistance, disposal of oil-contaminated cuttings, especially those using diesel, is harmful to the environment. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate less harmful or environmentally friendly alternatives, which is what this study aims to achieve by using coconut oil and shea butter oil.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	No, support the abstract with the most important quantitative results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Yes, The results make sense	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	No, The manuscript needs linguistic proofreading.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Figure 1 should be in the MATERIALS AND METHOD section and this section also needs more illustrations of the prepared oils and equipment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All figures and tables must be indicated in the text. - In "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION", it is preferable to re-display the Figs. in a clearer, more professional format. - It is very important to support the conclusion with quantitative results. - It is recommended to add a sentence to the recommendations stating to try or test hybrid oils (VCO & SBO). 	

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:	Saif Ali Kadhim
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq