

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_121792
Title of the Manuscript:	Effective Marginal Field Production using Electric Submersible Pump: Niger Delta Case Study
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 very relevant. Development of oil fields with difficult operating conditions is an important task. At present, reserves of light oils are almost exhausted. Therefore, the development of technologies for the extraction of heavy oils is now in great demand	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive	
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.	I think the authors need to add a mathematical description of the processes in the wells. The authors provide results obtained on computer models. But the formulas by which these calculations are made need to be provided.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think the references are sufficient and recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There are no mathematical formulas in the article. I think the article can be strengthened with mathematical expressions. The article has many diagrams and graphs, but mathematical laws are needed to explain them.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marat Khakimyanov</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ufa State Petroleum Technological University, Russia</b>