



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_11364
Title of the Manuscript:	Calcareous Nannofossil Biostratigraphic Analysis of Well 'K-2', Deep Offshore Niger Delta, Nigeria
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 <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 TITLE ABSTRACT INTRODUCTION 1.2. objectives Ligne 75. *	Clear and precise Some minor corrections in the section sentence of 40-45 lines seems too long. It would be useful to separate the main objective of the study of its secondary objectives It would be useful to quote some salient references	Thank you Corrections have been effected Thank you for the comment but I think the sentence is not long. It explains the subject matter This has been done This has also been effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>2. Material and methods</p> <p>2.2. Preparation</p> <p>3.2. Calcareous - nannofossil 138 to 164</p> <p>Figure 3.</p> <p>3.5. Zonation based on..</p> <p>Line 222</p> <p>3.6. Sequence stratigraphy</p>	<p>It would be useful to quote some salient references</p> <p>For a standard method, it is sufficient to it just a few lines!</p> <p>Many revisions proposed</p> <p>In this figure, species names are barely legible. Moreover why only sixteen species are plotted ??? Where are the others ?</p> <p>Lines 218-220 must be inserted in Method</p> <p>Probably Gephyrocapsa caribbeanica</p> <p>Lines 264-274 must be inserted in Method</p>	<p>References were quoted where necessary</p> <p>This is not very clear but I have outlined the procedure for the standard method. Thank you</p> <p>All the corrections have been effected</p> <p>Thank you for this observation. I think species names are clear enough. Yes sixteen species were plotted, others are too minor to be plotted and that was why they were listed.</p> <p>This correction has been effected</p> <p>Yes you are right, I have corrected it</p> <p>Thank you, it has been effected as suggested</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

CONCLUSION Lines 294-295	Never detailed material in Conclusion	Okay, thank you, I have made necessary adjustments
REFERENCES	Relatively old references. only four (04) references are less than 12 years	I have added more recent references, thank you.
PLATE 2 Line 396	This species is already mentioned and illustrated on Plate 1. So it could be removed	Thank you for the observation, I have removed it.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	SEE the minor revisions on syntaxe within the text	Corrections have been effected
Optional/General comments	Without being a specialist of Nannofossilstratigraphy, I note that this work is an interesting contribution. But the age of the references did not allow more efficient discussions of these data. Some. It will be useful to include five other recent references (from 2010) Some adjustments are needed to make more readable the information contained in some figures	I have added more recent references. Thank you for your observations