



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>    |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2015_PSIJ_16512   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | 3D STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF OTU FIELD, NIGER DELTA, NIGERIA |
| 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)   |
|--|---|---|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p><b>The manuscript is badly organized. The text needs extensive revision. The results presented are largely, incorrect and physically unreasonable.</b></p> <p><b>The figures are of poor quality. All of them needs redrafting. In many, the units of horizontal and vertical axes are illegible.</b></p> <p><b>The discussion part of the text describing structural features (illustrated in Figures 11, 12, 13) is highly speculative and unsubstantiated. This is also true of the part of the manuscript describing RMS amplitude maps, in Figures 14, 15 and 16.</b></p> <p>Figure 2 is the same as Figure 7 in USGS OF report 99-50H, Chapter A.</p> <p>Figure 3 is the same as Figure 16 in USGS OF report 99-50H, Chapter A</p> <p><b>See attached file for additional details.</b></p> | <p>Fig .2 and Fig .3 are properly referenced. And could also be found in somany other text.</p> <p>The results presented here are not mere speculations as the reviewer is pointing out.</p> <p>The corrections in the attached manuscript were trying to move the discussion away from the authors ideas to some thing else . some of these corrections though were effected</p> |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      |   |   |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    |   |   |