

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
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)
<u>Compulsory REVISION</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Get better figures for figure one as there are numerous figures from other authors which are clearer - Fig 5 & 6: the authors should only show the wavelet extraction & sonic calibration of the horizons mapped. This makes the figures simple thereby giving more information at first glance. Same applies for figure 7 	Making the figure simple is not the issue the issue is the science that is being transmitted.
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments	The authors might want to shorten the introduction which is in itself more than the main body of the research paper	Introduction is reduced
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors could consider using other seismic attributes other than RMS amplitude as only one attribute could give wide inference which is not necessarily right. Bright spots are not all in all suggestive of hydrocarbon accumulations, the authors might want to put that in mind in selecting which seismic attributes to use	The work here is not focusing on the Attributes, attributes could be another article