



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10555
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Two Tetrapolymers as Viscosifiers and Fluid Loss Reducers
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	The authors investigated the synthesis and evaluation of two tetrapolymers with unique functional characteristics of thermal stability, hydrolysis resistance and salt tolerance to enhance viscosity and reduce fluid-loss in water-based drilling fluids. In general, the research is interesting and well demonstrated especially the experimental section was described in detail. However, the current manuscript may not be accepted for some reason. The abstract should be written into two or three paragraphs and the place and duration of this study is not necessary unless it is defined by British Journal of Applied Science & Technology. Besides, there are some spell problems, such as the "synthesise" in the first line and the "focussed" in the line 72. My recommendation is revision and re-examination of the paper after all the above points have been dealt with.	Although we respect the views of the reviewer, the Abstract was written following the guidelines spelt out by BJAST. Place and duration of this study have deleted as recommended by the reviewer. Other corrections have been made as suggested and indicated in yellow as demanded
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It is recommended to strengthen the discussion and to use more data to support the conclusion.	Some medication and corrections have been done in response to reviewer's suggestions



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is better to make more comparison on the performance of those two tetrapolymers.	Suggestions accepted and implemented
---	---	---