



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
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 Article:	Short research article

### PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title does not reflect the study. You did not map hydrates, you mapped pockmarks. There is a difference.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Line 31-32. Did you make these maps or has this been done before? Citation needed.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>6. Lines 70-71 citation needed.</li> <li>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!”</li> <li>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.</li> <li>9. Figure 3 is blurry and not needed.</li> <li>10. Lines 130-394 – This is known information and completely irrelevant to your paper or what you did. Remove.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>12. Methods section needs revised to include modeling parameters, data collection parameters and interpretation methods.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>14. References in the text were not included in the reference section.</li> </ol>	<p>OK Noted</p>