



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	<p>Abstract should be re-written. It is my view, as I stand to be corrected, that it does not correctly capture the theme of the research/manuscript in its present form, it seems to me as an introductory remark.</p> <p>The author(s) should endeavour to make reference to captions/figures in the text before it is displayed within the manuscript, this guides the reader and carries the reader along. Check all the figures.</p> <p>Lines 181 – 359 do not have any close relationship with the subject matter (ie as regards the occurrence of gas hydrates in the Niger delta); this should/must be addressed, otherwise the work may quickly pass for a review of gas hydrates occurrence and their significance.</p> <p>Sediments in the Niger Delta are not as old as The Albian times as stated by the author(s); please this must be corrected, see lines 362 – 363. Note also that, the introduction is too long and not in any way concise, but with good understanding of the subject matter, the author(s) can greatly improve on this.</p> <p>Author(s) should comment on the sources of their images (Figs 8 - 13); and should emphasize the location in the description of the illustrations.</p> <p>The statement of line 538, “the temperature, pressure high stability zone,” has only come in the conclusion, and was not substantiated with table(s) of data in the result from where such conclusion was to be drawn.</p> <p>In the methodology/Flowchart, no mention was made of “3D seismic data/cube, but it is mentioned in line 540, as though it was used to draw conclusions. This should be removed.</p> <p>Data source as quoted in line 518 “Georges and Cauquil 2007 is not listed in the reference; so are others in this manuscript, for instance, Rehder et al 2004. Author(s) should thoroughly checked them.</p>	Noted.
Minor REVISION comments	In my own opinion, the author(s) need(s) to look again at the data they have and properly choose a clearly thought-through topic to justify their scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	At this present format, it is almost as though the author is introducing this study from lines 517 – 529; after which the next caption is “conclusion”.	