

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124326
Title of the Manuscript:	Geochemical Evaluation of the Silurian, Devonian, and Carboniferous Source Rocks at the Erawin Field, Murzuq Basin, SW Libya
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.	- The article is important as it focuses on the geochemical assessment of Silurian, Devonian, and Carboniferous source rocks in the Erawin Field, Murzuq Basin. The researcher has thoroughly addressed all key points, making the title well-aligned with the content.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	- Yes, it is very matched.	
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.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	- Yes, it is appropriate considering the below comments.	
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.	- Please standardize the unit for TOC (either wt.% or mg HC/g) in the Abstract. - The theoretical section could be reduced to maintain focus on the core findings. - The conclusion is too general and should be more focused on the specific results of the research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	- References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- The language is clear and grammatically correct overall. However, there are minor typos and a few missing letters in some words that require a quick review by the researcher.	
Optional/General comments	The research is generally suitable for publication after implementing the suggested recommendations.	

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:	Mohammad Ahmad Elsaqqa
Department, University & Country	Al-Azhar University, Egypt