



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
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	<i>Original Research Article</i>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Abstract: In your abstract you indicated that your interval falls between 3405ft to 10640ft, but in your interpretation you showed depth of studied section up to 10900ft. State the true well section you studied. 1. Introduction: Add a map showing the study location. 2. Material and Methods: Renumber your lithology description (2.2.1), palynological analysis (2.2.2), etc to be under Methods. Your 2.0 is the Material and Methods. Therefore, your methods should be 2.2 whereas Materials should be 2.1. 3. Give a detailed presentation of your lithologic description against depth that helped you to construct Figure 3. Your Figure 3 has a wide range of depth (3400 – 10900ft) representing just one sequence of deposition (nearshore shallow marine to deep marine). It is possible that there are similar repeated cycles of deposition indicating the pattern you have represented in Figure 3. So, your detailed lithologic description against depth will reveal depositional trends within the studied interval. 4. Results In lines 104 to 107, describe the properties of the shale and sand differently. Properties of shale and sand tend to be mixed together as one. 5. References: [33-34] listed in the reference is not cited in the work. [35, 37] cited in the work is not listed in the reference. Note that your reference list ends at 34.	1. I want to thank the reviewer for noting this and it has been worked upon. The mistake on the figure is actually editing work as one moves it around different packages. The actual depth is 3405 to 10640ft. This has been amended. 2. The map has been added to show the possible location of the study area. I need to explain here that the well used for this study is a new well belonging one of the IOC in Nigeria. As a result, the actual location was not given to protect the proprietary law, nevertheless, the well still remain an offshore area in Niger Delta.. 3. The renumbering has been done to conform to the suggestion of the reviewer under Material and Methods. 4. Including this in the body of the work will make the work more cumbersome and too voluminous. This is a cuttings which is more than 300 samples. This necessitated the compositing it at 100ft thus reducing it to 62 composited samples. For the litholog description, all the over 300 samples were studied, that will be too voluminous for the journal. However, the legend of figure 4, revealed the litholog for each of the sample interval which will serve the desired purpose. 5. The properties of the shale and sand has been worked and improved upon. The



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>conclusion will clear the air on why the discussion seems mixed up. The formation is a paralic sequence in Niger delta. 6. The numbering has been corrected. No 35 is now 33 while 37 is now 34. Thanks.</i>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	My comments have been attended to by author. Manuscript is good for publication	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Prince S. Momta</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ciscon Geological Service department, Nigeria</i>