



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_42144
Title of the Manuscript:	Geochemical Characteristics of Six Formations Based on Organic Geochemical Parameters, Murzuq Basin, Libya
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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) . Thank you, very good points, take to more improvement
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. Abstract must be revised	1. The author mentioned Taouratine, Dembaba, Assedjefar Marar, Awaynat Wanin, Tanezzuft and Mamuniyat Formations, but in the table 1 and 2, we see the new formation Hot shale.  2. The author mentioned that hydrogen index (HI) ranged between 24 - 302 mg HC/g TOC as the oil prone. I think it is not true The HI 200 -300 is mixed gas and oil prone which dominated by gas prone; HI >600 is the oil prone; HI 300- 600 is mixed oil and gas prone which dominated by oil.  3. Table 3 Aromatic hydrocarbon ratios based on peak areas gas chromatography - mass spectrometry only give the value of aromatic ratio, but the author didn't give the information what the range of level thermal maturity. It is should be useful if the author use the ratio to determine Ro calculated as proposed by Radke et al, 1982.  4. Key word is too much (usually we use 5-6 word)	1- Authors agree the referee. They adjusted this issue in all texts, where put in the table 1 as part of Tanezzuft and in table 2 as symbol.  2- Authors adjusted this sentence and mentioned as data resulted.  3- The Reviewer's comment has accepted and section 4.2.1. (Aromatic molecular biomarker ) has adjusted ( <i>highlight</i> ) as the referee suggested and referenced by Radke et al, 1982.  4- Key words are adjusted
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>Introduction must be revised</b>  Result and discussion  Conclusion must be revised	1. The API by gamma ray from C1 in concession 174 recorded 800 units with Tanezzuft thickness more than 15m [1]. the statements are not clear. What is mean of C1 in concession 174. we don't see the gamma ray log of well.  1, Tabel 1. well H15 must be explauned what mean " non "  Conclusion 2, the author must clearly write the value of Tmax and PY	1. The C1 is well C1 in filed C of concession 174. the gamma ray do not log of well, but the measurements were on organic matter of sample, was taken from that thickness.  2. That right. All (non) in table 1 are adjusted  3. Yes, Authors rewrite Conclusion 2 to be clear
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		