



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31189
Title of the Manuscript:	Formation Damage Analysis due to Filtrate Invasion in Deviated Wells: A Numerical Approach
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 general, the discussion is very shallow or just reporting the modelling results without further details discussion. Therefore need further discussion on the results and cross references with theory and previous studies.	I did not just report modelling results further discussions were made under each figure and under CONCLUSION subsection.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Better to clearly mention in introduction that reference (8) was analytical approach. Something missing in sentence line 119. Better to include the empirical relationship use (ref no. 9) in line 76. Some symbols used were not in the Definition, Acronyms, abb. Section. Need to include all.	Correction effected. Correction effected. Correction effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Based on writing style, better to use Author and year (Alphabet format) for cited references. Need more recent related references.	Reference citation used were based on the Journal's format.