

The corrected revised paper is attached for perusal sir. Reviewer's filled form for is also attached. The second reviewer's comment and rebuttal is pasted below because of difficulty in attaching it.

Am afraid, the article still needs major revision before it can be accepted for publication. Considering the improvement from the initial manuscript, I will advise the author to effect the corrections in the attachment, paying attention to the use of small 'f' for Formation, citing the work of others in the results section and overall the use of passive language for discussion of results. The references should be written alphabetically and in adherence to the standard of the journal. However, the new revision does not have to be re-evaluated by the reviewer.

Rebuttal

- All corrections have been made as indicated
- Paleoenvironment can be written as done in the manuscript just like the one suggested by you
- Senegalinium sp. was found in the samples; identified and interpreted. I have practiced palynology for over 18 years in the oil industry before I joined academics. So, am familiar with forms from Early Cretaceous to Pleistocene.
- Eocene -Younger is preferred to Eocene-Recent because no Recent form is present in the samples
- Another reviewer suggested removal of abundance/occurrence chart which was done accordingly
- Maastrichtian is written as used in the manuscript. Please check other journal including the work of Boboye, (2012) and textbooks
- The references were written according to instruction in the template of the Journal. They should be numbered and follow the order of appearance in the text NOT ALPHABETICAL.
- I thank you so much for Boboye, (2012) you sent to me. It was found useful in few cases. But I have reservations for his biozone definitions and boundaries. More especially Fika Formation that is dated Maastrichtian to Eocene. No report of Gombe and Kerri-kerri formations which are present in the work of Ola-Buraimo, (2012) for the same Tuma -1 well he studied. The lithofacies differentiation for respective Formation is inconclusive and not well articulated for correlation purpose. I believe these are the areas that this paper tends to bridge the gap.

I thank you so much for your immense contribution in improving the quality of this

- All corrections have been made as indicated

- Paleoenvironment can be written as done in the manuscript just like the one suggested by you

- Senegalinium sp. was found in the samples; identified and interpreted. I have practiced palynology for over 18 years in the oil industry before I joined academics. So, am familiar with forms from Early Cretaceous to Pleistocene.

- Eocene -Younger is preferred to Eocene-Recent because no Recent form is present in the samples

- Another reviewer suggested removal of abundance/occurrence chart which was done accordingly

- Maastrichtian is written as used in the manuscript. Please check other journal including the work of Boboye, (2012) and textbooks

- The references were written according to instruction in the template of the Journal. They should be numbered and follow the order of appearance in the text NOT ALPHABETICAL.

- I thank you so much for Boboye, (2012) you sent to me. It was found useful in few cases. But I have reservations for his biozone definitions and boundaries. More especially Fika Formation that is dated Maastrichtian to Eocene. No report of Gombe and Kerri-kerri formations which are present in the work of Ola-Buraimo, (2012) for the same Tuma -1 well he studied. The lithofacies differentiation for respective Formation is inconclusive and not well articulated for correlation purpose.

paper.

**I believe these are the areas that
this paper tends to bridge the gap.**

**I thank you so much for your
immense contribution in improving
the quality of this paper.**