EDITOR'S COMMENT

You can find my desicion related with the manuscript named "OCCURRENCE OF GAS CHARGED SEDIMENTS AND POCK MARKS IN "EMOBS" FIELDS OFFSHORE WESTERN NIGER DELTA: IMPLICATIONS ON SUBSEA FACILITIES" at the attached files.

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Editor's comment
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	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.	The corrections suggested by the referee have not been completed.
	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.	The corrections suggested by the referee have not been completed.
	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.	There are 3 sources in the text but 7 sources are listed.
	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.	
	Author(s) should comment on the sources of their images (Figs 8 - 13); and should emphasize the location in the description of the illustrations.	
	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. 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.	The corrections suggested by the referee have not been completed. For example, although it was emphasized in the revision, the reference is given for figure 3 but not for figure 8.
	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.	The corrections suggested by the referee have not been completed.

AUTHOR'S FEEDBACK

The abstract has been rewritten.

Author have mention the figures in the text before referencing.

Author have commented on the figures with respect to their sources.

The lines are in the previous version that has gas hydrate.
All the comments have been taken of.

Please peruse well.