



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12754
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS OF SHALE FOR EVALUATING SHALE DRILLING FLUID INTERACTION IN AGBADA FORMATION
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	However it can be clearly seen, how wide and interesting work the authors done, the article should be improved before publication. Some suggestions are listed below. It is suggested to check and unify the references; the marking should be the same in the whole text. Materials and methods section: All methods advantages/applicability are well described, but poor information about the set parameters is given, it would be worth to detail how that methods were applied (equipment's settings, equipment's type, factory and so on). For example the reader can only suppose, that the rheological measurements were maybe performed by an old type of rotational viscometer, as several parameters were calculated, which nowadays can be determined by the rheometers software. Shale rolling test should be described detailed in methods section to make the measurement clear even for non-specialists. It would be also interesting, how/by which method the authors determined the adsorption isotherms data, and from time to time it would be nice to see the applied method's name again in the article, as after some pages it is sometimes not clear which method is it written about; or at least authors could refer to section 2.1. (An exception is XRF measurement, which is quite well described.) Results and discussion section: However, the applied units are well known, they should be	The references have been corrected. The test procedures have been described as observed. The method has been stated in the corrected script.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	given in SI, for example, Yield point, Plastic viscosity...and so on. Data given in the text should not be tabulated and vice versa. For example. Table 3, 4 How can be the data of Table 2 given as integers? Fig.4 and 5 needs further explanation, which sample's data do they show? The single sample's rheograms (before and after dispersion test) plotted together would give important information about the rheological type of the samples, it is suggested to plot like this. It is also suggested to check how the single ion (Na^+, K^+, Ca^{2+}) contents and the TOC value changes correlate with each other regarding as former investigation have found that in case of clay and soil suspensions there is an optimal Ca^{2+} content: TOC ratio, which effects the strongest structure. In the sentence in row 324: „The results show that the dispersed solids in the fluids were large.” are the authors thinking on the particle size? It would be nice to see a deeper conclusion, for example the results of tables 14 and 15 could be involved into this section.	The table represent their weight % More information has been added to explain the figures. The tables have been merged, so that the results can be compared. The information is in Discussion of Results. The different in particle size seem to be the first observation after sieving the samples. The conclusion was drawn from the tables also.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		