



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31184
Title of the Manuscript:	RATE DECLINE-BASED MODELS FOR GAS RESERVOIR PERFORMANCE PREDICTION IN NIGER DELTA REGION
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In abstract and conclusion, it is mentioned that quadratic model can be used as a quick tool but there is no information about how much it is quick. No computer time or calculation time comparison. Also it is seen in figure 7 and 9, different field data is used in comparison and that is not correct. If the normalized data is used in figures then label of y axis should be different. Moreover, Figure A-6 to 8 is unreadable. In figure A1-5 using different line type would be beneficial to see the models efficiency. In some of the other figures, symbol of model and field seem same. Another point is that using trend line in figures are not necessary and it is confusing as line are so thick, lines should be thinner in all figures.	Here the quick tool implies that the fitted model can be used as a hand on equation to calculate/estimate the performance of the field; without need to find the decline constant of the field. Figures 7 and 9 slight disparity has been handled in the manuscript. We have tried to handle the clarity of Figures A-6 to A-8 now Figures B-6 to B-8. Also, the lines in Figures A-1 to A-5 now Figures B-1 to B-5 have been reduced in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Table 2 and 3 should be replaced after where they are first mentioned. Page 2, why is not there any reference to eq. 1	Nice comment, but Tables 2 and 3 present the results, it will be appropriate to be in Results and Discussion Caption. Equation reference is included.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Following references could be added: Kamari, Arash, et al. "Decline curve based models for predicting natural gas well performance." Petroleum (2016).	The reference is added on the manuscript.