



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31998
Title of the Manuscript:	Biostratigraphy of Ochigbo–1 Well, Offshore Niger Delta; Evidence from Foraminifera, Spores and Pollen
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound, contains relevant and novelty information. 2. The data are well controlled and robust. 3. The references cited are current and relevant. 4. Is necessary to add more references at the Material and Methods & RESULT AND DISCUSSION sections. 5. Review the grammar and syntax in the redaction. 6. Maps and images should be at a high resolution format	Thanks for the comments. As per your comment on additional references, i am of the opinion that methodology of palynological and foraminifera are in the public domain and including more or additional references will only encumbered the work and as such, i think anyone interested in the methodology could search for it. The grammar and syntax have been looked into and most of the images especially on foraminifera forms etc have been improved upon to make it more readable and of high resolution. Thanks.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		