

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
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

MARKS AND SEEPAGE SITES.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Autho
		the ma
		manu
		his/he
Compulsory REVISION comments	Please find the comments below:	
	The manuscript (Ms_AJARR_40990) presents results about Occurrence of gas hydrates in sediments in "Emobs fields offshore western Niger delta: pock marks and seepage sites. Authors have made an attempt to understan the gas hydrates shallow deposits and structures by evaluating the morphological changes and distribution in Niger delt offshore basin. There is a definite scope to improve the quality of paper. Authors are suggested to address th comments given below with subsequent revision of the manuscript:	d a
	 The English level of manuscript should be updated by native English editor especially grammatical errors. Also check for minor mistakes like in Line 206, its gaining increasing recognition, it should be either gaining o increasing. 	r
	 Line 75: Pockmarks A and C discussed here are not mentioned anywhere in any figure. Please show for better understanding. 	
	 There is no clarity and continuous repetition of theory. For E.g. Line 122 to 127, reframe the sentence to make it clearer. 	
	 Line 181 to 384: there is continuous repetition of gas hydrate facts in different subheadings. Please reconstruct the structure in concise manner. 	
	5. Line 415: please provide the detailed explanation of Figure 6.	
	6. Line 473: Explain the Figure 14 properly for better understanding.	
	 Line 525 & 543, authors have mentioned about modeling and its results which has not discussed anywhere in the manuscript. 	1
	 I think pock marks could have been described in a better way like description of geomorphologically different types of pock marks on the seafloor. 	
	9. Figures such as figure 8 and 9 are not clearly visible.	
	 I think it would be better if there is a bathymetric map of this region showing actual pock marks and their trends. 	
	 Introduction must be improved with proper references as mentioned below: Marine Georesources & Geotechnology (2018): 1-10 	
	(<u>doi.org/10.1080/1064119X.2018.1443181</u>); <u>doi.org/10.1080/1064119X.2018.1443181</u> , 2012; Oil & Gas Science and Technology–Revue d'IFP Energies nouvelles 70 (6), 1087-1099, 2017.	
Minor REVISION comments		+
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajay Mandal
Department, University & Country	Department of Petroleum Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (ISM) Dhanbad, India

thor's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct manuscript and highlight that part in the nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write /her feedback here)