



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_40990
Title of the Manuscript:	OCCURRENCE OF GAS HYDRATES IN SEDIMENTS IN “EMOBS” FIELDS OFFSHORE WESTERN NIGER DELTA: POCK MARKS AND SEEPAGE SITES.
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>)



SDI 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title does not reflect the study. You did not map hydrates, you mapped pockmarks. There is a difference. 2. The abstract is very unclear and disjointed. This needs to be rewritten to include what this study is about, what the authors did, and a line that states the conclusion of the study. 3. There are significant grammatical errors throughout the entirety of this paper. Thorough editing needed. This includes paragraph structure, sentence structure, incomplete sentences, run on sentences, and word selection/tense. 4. Line 31-32. Did you make these maps or has this been done before? Citation needed. 5. Lines 53-79 organize this better. This is one very large, rambling paragraph. Break it up. For example, Line 58 should start a new paragraph. 6. Lines 70-71 citation needed. 7. Lines 86-119. Again, this is one large, rambling paragraph. Organize your thoughts and break it up. Line 102 should start new paragraph... however it is repetitive information. Citations needed throughout. This is a science paper, the authors need to remove unneeded phrases such as "If you hold a hydrate nodule in your hand and light it with a match, it will burn like a lantern wick. There is fire in this ice!" 8. Lines 102-127 should be condensed and included in the introduction. This is just random information/facts about hydrates and does not contribute anything to your specific paper/study. 9. Figure 3 is blurry and not needed. 10. Lines 130-394 – This is known information and completely irrelevant to your paper or what you did. Remove. 11. You need to explain your numerical modeling explicitly in the methods section and discussion. I saw a figure but then you did not discuss it in any detail. 12. Methods section needs revised to include modeling parameters, data collection parameters and interpretation methods. 13. Lines 543-544 – you should not be quoting other's work in your conclusion. This should be in the discussion. A conclusion should summarize your results only. 14. References in the text were not included in the reference section. 	Noted.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The pockmark figures and modelling are interesting and merit consideration for publication, but the manuscript as a whole is very poorly written, includes significant nonrelevant information, and needs major revisions.	Noted.
----------------------------------	--	---------------