

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_111882
Title of the Manuscript:	VOLUMETRIC ANALYSIS OF SELECTED RESERVOIRS IN OGBENU FIELD, NIGER DELTA, NIGERIA USING 3D SEISMIC AND WELL LOG DATA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Volumetric analysis of reservoir rocks aids in resource management and economic decision-making. Hence, this work is important to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive as it did not include the numerical findings of the research work.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. This cannot be ascertained as the numerical procedures were not outlined in the research work.</p> <p>6. No, the references are not sufficient neither are they recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The methodology of the research work is lacking in that it did not include the numerical models that would be used to obtain the desired results, especially during the petrophysical analysis. This is very important as any scientific research should be repeatable, even in the absence of the original author, to obtain the same results. Without these numerical models, this research is not repeatable in the absence of the original author.</p> <p>2. Some of the results obtained have not been shown, for instance the result of the created synthetic seismogram and the seismic-to-well ties are missing. So how do we know that this part of the research was carried out?</p> <p>3. The results have not been validated, relative to existing literature, to ascertain whether the obtained results are the same/different for typical sandstone reservoirs in the Niger Delta as presented in previous existing literature.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Onengiyeofori A. Davies
Department, University & Country	Rivers State University, Nigeria