



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_40990</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>OCCURRENCE OF GAS HYDRATES IN SEDIMENTS IN “EMOBS” FIELDS OFFSHORE WESTERN NIGER DELTA: POCK MARKS AND SEEPAGE SITES.</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Katie Taladay</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Geography and Environment, University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA</b>