

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JGEESI_123739 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | LITHOSTRATIGRAPHIC CHARACTERISATION OF SENONIAN DEPOSITS ON THE ABIDJAN MARGIN |
| Type of the Article | Short Research 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> |
|--|--|---|
| <p>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.</p> | | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>I would like to extend my gratitude to the authors for granting permission for the Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International to review their work entitled "LITHOSTRATIGRAPHIC CHARACTERISATION OF SENONIAN DEPOSITS ON THE ABIDJAN MARGIN" before its publication. After reviewing the manuscript, several concerns are raised, and these questions must be answered before the manuscript can be considered for publication.</p> <p>The following feedback has been taken into consideration:</p> <p>1. Abstract section:</p> <p>The objective, method, results, and conclusion headings do not have to be written in the abstract section. Kindly write an abstract that focuses on the objectives, the methodology, the results, or the conclusion, excluding any necessary headers. The spelling and grammar of English need to be improved. Part of the issue has been resolved from the attachment.</p> <p>2. Discussion section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide a workflow and present the procedures that you followed for the process of investigating the possibility of the presence of hydrocarbon in this area with details to help the readability of the manuscript. ➤ The procedure of litho-stratigraphic classification should be explained in detail. ➤ In the conclusion section, on what basis is this sentence (normal faults and reflectors highlight lenticular structures that suggest the existence of hydrocarbon traps) mentioned? Please give a detailed description. ➤ From the hydrocarbon exploration perspectives, discuss the present and future prospects of the subject basin and formations. ➤ Discuss the petroleum system elements for the hydrocarbon exploration prospective of this area. ➤ The literature review section needs further investigation. More explanations should be given about the lithological description, sedimentary sequence, results and discussion section. <p>3. Conclusion and reference section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The conclusions should be refined and rewritten. ➤ The authors need to do a more comprehensive literature review and include more recent works in the Manuscripts. Please add a more valuable reference in every section for the improvement of the quality and acceptability of your manuscript. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 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. | | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

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: | Rabeya Basri |
| Department, University & Country | University of Dhaka, Bangladesh |