

Manuscript: **“Paleoenvironments and Hydrocarbon Potential of Upper Cretaceous Shales in Agbabu-1 Well, Dahomey Basin SW Nigeria”**

Submitted: 24 July 2021

Accepted: 14 October 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Soro Dramane

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1:

Reviewer 2:

Reviewer 3:

Reviewer 4:

Reviewer 5:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-11-15 01:26 AM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

no

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adapted to the content of the article; however, it has more than 15 words.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

In the ABSTRACT not you explicit in objective of the investigation, neither the used methodology

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article has an appropriate writing, they were not grammatical errors neither of spelling

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology used in the investigation is presented with enough clarity.

The body of the paper

There are units that don't fulfill the international system, for example, ml is written; however, the correct is mL.

It lacks the degree symbol in some units of degrees celsius.

The charts don't fulfill the edition norms.

There are unnecessary spaces among words.

The authors use different citation forms, for example:

Adekeye et al 2019

Adeoye et al. 2021

Clementz et. al 1979

Didyk et. al., 1978

Ekweozor & Udo, 1988

Ekweozor and Udo , 1988

The appointment (Murray and Wright, 194) is incorrect.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSIONS respond to the results of the investigation; however, it is considered that they are many and some of them are very concise.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The bibliographical references are outdated, because only the 3,6% of them (two references) they correspond to the last ones five and 10 years. That is to say, the remaining ones (53 references) they have more than 10 years of having published.

It is not ordered the bibliographical references alphabetically.

It makes an appointment to Adeoye et al. 2021, however, it doesn't appear in the bibliographical references.

In the bibliographical references the following sources appear: Espitalie, J., G. Deroo, and F. Marquis (1985); Nishi, H, Reishi, T, Takayuki, H, Tsunemasa Saito, Kazuyoshi Moriya, Atsuhito., E, and Toshiaki. S, (2003); however, they are not mentioned in the article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission

• ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-11-16 04:08 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

yes

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes

- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

It is good, However I recommend a review by an English speaker.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There is no reference for figure 5

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject