



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14026
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementing Acid Breakdown Job Selection Technique Proved to be the key Drive down Cost of Gas Lift Completion and Maintaining to Improving Production in Amal Reservoir (B) of the Sirte Basin, Libya
Type of the Article	Case Study

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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	This paper presents implementing of 'Acid Breakdown Job Selection Technique' in cost reduction and production incensement. The topic is fully in the scope of the journal but this paper does not contain any scientific aspect. This document is a very short paper that concerns only implementing of Acid Breakdown Job Selection Technique. Also the presentation is very confusing. [1]Amal reservoir 'B' was responded positively to the Acid treatment? Can you quantitatively describe the degree of responds? [2]the Production increased by a ratio 299.4% by optimum gas injection rate 0.75 MSCF/Day, this is rather good, but do you consider newly generated unfavorable factors on cost or operation with this gas injection rate? [3]From reference [12], the treatment consisted of: 12200 gal of main treatment 15% HCL acid with	1. The respond of Amal formation was described in economic impacts section. 2. There are some concerns about unfavourable factors added at the end of methodology and procedures section. 3. Regard the quantity volume of main treatment 15% Hcl and 12200 gal that was actually pumping on location, although the estimate volume was 12000 gal of main treatment and 200 gal for pickle tubing and cut 200 gal stage and add to the main treatment because the formation was vacuum. From other side the displacement of water, I estimate the volume around 5000 gal but it was actually volume on location 6720 gal because of some reason of injectivity test was unstable before treaemt or after treatment that why the diffent number between estimate and actually volume . In addition I do not have number 6850 gal in our paper. 4. The description of surface facility capacity was discussed at the end of economic impacts section. 5. The format of the reference section was review and it was written in Harvard style.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Halliburton additives and 6720 gal of displacement of Water. Can you test other numbers :(12500, 6850), etc., and what's the difference? [4]In the abstract, you say,... the ability of the production tubing and surface facilities to handle the extra fluids should be also considered, but the manuscript does not mention any facilities to handle extra fluids. [5] The format of the reference needs to be improved, for example: Ref.[1] LIU H.H, LIU Z.B, DING, X.F. A New Oilfield Production Prediction Method Based On GM(1,n)[J]. Petroleum science and technology, 2014, 32(1):22-28.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		