



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Physical Science International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_31581
Title of the Manuscript:	SPATIAL VARIATION MODELING OF GEOTHERMAL GRADIENT AND HEAT FLOW IN EASTERN PARTS OF NIGER DELTA SEDIMENTARY BASIN, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Review paper

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It's obviously appropriate and constructive to improve the shortcomings in the language of the manuscript that significantly affect the quality of the paper. I advise the authors to find full professional proficiency in English to proofread the manuscript. The paper has no valuable results or research, especially that the area is not interesting in geothermal exploration. So, why did the author(s) choose this area for geothermal investigation? Is there any geothermal manifestation? Some information needs to add in the introduction part about the reasons to focus on geothermal properties of the study area.	The language has been improved The geothermal study is for hydrocarbon maturation and basin modelling.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Fig. 1 is in bad resolution and need to improve, also referring to your study area using rectangular instead of oval. Always superscript symbol of degree (°) in all text and figures. Unify the style of references list according to the instruction of Physical Science International Journal	Fig 1 has been changed. The study area has been indicated with rectangle. Subscript has been effected. REFERENCE HAS BEEN EFFECTED.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	the author(s) only succeeded to get 18 BHT logs and try to make some very simple statistical analyses. Even they did not mentioned about how they corrected BHT data.	The data were corrected by the industry before they were released