



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_56237
Title of the Manuscript:	Lithofacies, Palynostratigraphy and Paleoecology of the Outcropping Rock Succession at Ogbunike Toll gate, Niger Delta Basin, Nigeria
Type of the 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 (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	<p>The manuscript entitled “Lithofacies, Palynostratigraphy and Paleoecology of the Outcropping Rock Succession at Ogbunike Toll gate, Niger Delta Basin, Nigeria” describe and interpret the said outcrop aiming to re-interpret both age and environmental conditions of deposition. However, the justification beyond this research is not clearly stated and the corresponding outcomes of this research are hence, not evident (see below). This is, in my opinion, the main problem of this manuscript. Hence, I suggest mayor revisions before publishing in the Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International. Suggestions are described below.</p> <p>In the introduction section the authors indicated that this outcrop has already (in two occasions) been described, dated and stratigraphically assigned to different formations, and that the present research aims to re-interpret this outcrop. In this context, it is extremely important for the reader to understand why it is important to re-analyze and re-interpret this outcrop? What are the main strength and weaknesses of the preceding studies that allow a re-interpretation? This is key in order to highlight the importance of this manuscript in the present context. Then, it is important that the Discussion section is focused on the comparison with preceding studies in the light of the new outcomes of this work.</p> <p>A clear visual presentation of results and interpretations is key for a proper understanding of the research. In this sense, results and interpretations must be visualized in relation to the whole picture; i.e., to the whole outcrop and statigraphic units analyzed.</p> <p>In the Results section, for example, please show in figure 2 the distribution (along the stratigraphic units) of the samples used (i.e., NAK 5b, c..) for palynological and foraminifera analysis. Until reaching Table 4 the reader have no reference of these samples shown in Table 2, 3 and Figure 7. Please standardize the presentation of these tables and figures and include the stratigraphic units (i.e., mudstone) associated to each sample. Please re-evaluate the amount of tables and figures presented.</p> <p>It is also important to visualize interpretations (including lithographic associations, paleoecology, paleoclimatic and age determination) in a same figure. I suggest improving and extending the figure 2 including the main interpretations. I also suggest including these</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	interpretations in the first part of the Discussion section (and not in the Result section) and in a succinct way. In addition, interpretations must be supported by the bibliography that, in the present version of the manuscript, is very scarce. Bibliography used for faunal identification must also appear in the Methods section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paula Franco Fraguas
Department, University & Country	Universidad de la República, Uruguay