

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_86359
Title of the Manuscript:	RESERVOIR STUDY USING PETROPHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF AN OFFSHORE FIELD IN NIGER DELTA BASIN
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJOGER/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript can be accepted for publication only after the authors make the necessary corrections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title needs to be restructures as it is very miss leading. How can they say ..using petrophysical properties of an offshore field. Petrophysical properties are for reservoirs in the field. The title needs to be change to give reader the right sense. 2. The authors need to used the right terminologies for reservoir thickness gross thickness, net pay. This very common mistakes are available in line 14 of Introduction. 3. Figure 5 have been stretching out to much and nothing is visible in the chrono stratigraphy 4. The objective of this study has not been clearly stated in the introduction and it is worrisome to the reader. 5. The section on the petroleum system of the Niger Delta Basin need to be summarised in few sentences and included in the section comprising the geology of the basin. 6. I want to asked the authors are they the one that performed the logging operation in the field because the keep using the word acquired as if the performed the logging operation. If not then used the approximate word. 7. The methods are very void of so many explanation with regards to how the petrophysical parameters where obtain. They need to explain how the distinguish or the cut of values used in separating reservoirs from non-reservoirs. 8. The abstracts need to be rewritten as the first two lines are missing and the objective is not stated. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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:	Edwin Ayuk Ndip
Department, University & Country	University of Buea, Cameroon