



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
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

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>TITLE</b>  <b>ABSTRACT</b>  <b>INTRODUCTION</b>  <b>1.2. objectives</b>  <b>Ligne 75.</b>  *	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	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>2. Material and methods</b>	It would be useful to quote some salient references	
<b>2.2. Preparation</b>	For a standard method , it is sufficient to it just a few lines!	
<b>3.2. Calcareous - nannofossil</b>		
<b>138 to 164</b>	Many revisions proposed	
<b>Figure 3.</b>	In this figure, species names are barely legible. Moreover why only sixteen species are plotted ??? Where are the others ?	
<b>3.5. Zonation based on..</b>	Lines 218-220 must be inserted in Method	
<b>Line 222</b>	Probably <a href="#"><i>Gephyrocapsa caribbeanica</i></a>	
<b>3.6. Sequence stratigraphy</b>	Lines 264-274 must be inserted in Method	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>CONCLUSION</b> <b>Lines 294-295</b>	Never detailed material in Conclusion	
<b>REFERENCES</b>	Relatively old references. only four (04) references are less than 12 years	
<b>PLATE 2</b> <b>Line 396</b>	This species is already mentioned and illustrated on Plate 1. So it could be removed	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor REVISION comments</b>	SEE the minor revisions on syntaxe within the text	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	Without being a specialist of Nannofossil stratigraphy, 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	

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**