




Completing the Online Score Sheet

1. Save your work often!



2. Focus on content and technical quality, rather than on grammar, punctuation, figure and/or table quality, or sentence structure.

3. **Never reveal your identity.** SPE's peer-review process is single-blinded. Reviewers of papers are not identified to authors, but SPE reviewers have the author information.

4. Any fields marked with a red asterisk require an answer before the score sheet can be submitted.

Review SJ-0721-0009

Test Title	
Journal:	SPE Journal
Manuscript ID:	SJ-0721-0009
Manuscript Type:	Technical Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Jul-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Author, Adam Author, Abigail; ExxonMobil,
Keywords:	well site preparation

Files: Lists all individual files that you have access to.

Details: Author names and company affiliation as well as access to Proof files.

Review SJ-0721-0009

Test Title	
Status	Awaiting Technical Editor Selection
Author(s)	Author, Adam Author, Abigail - ExxonMobil
Manuscript Type	Technical Paper
Submitted Proof	22-Jul-2021 Open PDF Open HTML
Abstract	View Abstract
Admin	Hughes, Stacie

Any fields marked with a red asterisk require an answer before you can submit the score sheet.

Originality and Significance	
* 1. To the best of your knowledge, has this paper, or very similar content by these or other author(s), been published previously in a periodical? If yes , please state where in the comments below. Note: <i>An answer of Yes is an automatic decline, since papers cannot be accepted under these conditions.</i>	Select... ▼ Select... Yes No
* 2. Does this paper present novel or additive information to the existing body of literature? This can also be interpreted to mean presenting existing information in a new way that can be of benefit to a practicing engineer. If no , please explain your answer below and identify the existing literature or common knowledge of the subject. Note: <i>Field case histories should provide a new/original practical use of existing technology and should be judged accordingly.</i>	Select... ▼

Manuscript Central Online Score Sheet
All scores and comments will be made available to the author of the paper to provide him/her appropriate feedback to improve the manuscript. Please phrase your comments as you would if you were writing to the author directly. Ethics of a reviewer

Key Areas of Review
Please rate this paper in the following areas. Explain Good , Fair and Poor ratings and provide suggestions for improvement in the comments section; if you need more space, attach a Word document with your comments. If you do not adequately support your rating, this review will be returned to you for further explanation.

Technical Content	
* 1. Overall approach, including experimental or mathematical techniques, is appropriate and sound.	Select... ▼
* 2. Sufficient data or explanation of mathematical techniques (especially computer programs) is presented to allow experts in the field to replicate results.	Select... ▼
* 3. Interpretation of results is sound.	Select... ▼
* 4. Discussion is appropriate and avoids undue speculation about significance of results.	Select... ▼
* 5. Conclusions are sound and supported by material presented in the paper.	Select... ▼
* 6. References are adequate and appropriate.	Select... ▼

Select...

Excellent
Very good
Good
Fair
Poor

Ease of Understanding *(Please do not focus on grammar, punctuation or SPE style. The questions only pertain to whether the writing style is sufficiently clear to make the technical content understandable.)*

* 1. The title clearly reflects the paper's contents.	Select... ▼
* 2. The summary (abstract) adequately informs readers of the paper's key content.	Select... ▼
* 3. The organization of the paper is logical.	Select... ▼
* 4. The length of the paper is appropriate (long enough to sufficiently cover the topic; does not include extraneous or repetitive information.)	Select... ▼
* 5. The number and quality of figures and tables are adequate to support the technical content.	Select... ▼
* 6. Commercial references are limited to what is appropriate to support the technical content.	Select... ▼

Select...
Excellent
Very good
Good
Fair
Poor

Select the appropriate rating that supports **Originality and Significance**, **Technical Content**, and **Ease of Understanding** criteria.

Recommendation for Publication

Please make your recommendation based on the following:

1. **Publishable-Minor**: Minor revisions to Technical Aspects and Ease of Understanding
2. **Publishable-Major**: Minor revisions of Technical Aspects and major revisions of Ease of Understanding
3. **Unpublishable** because of major inadequacies in Originality, Significance, or Technical Aspects.

* **Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

* **Recommendation**

- ☐ Publishable-No Changes
☐ Publishable-Minor Changes
☐ Publishable-Major Changes
☐ Unpublishable

Text in the “Confidential Comments to the Executive Editor” section is for internal use only and will not be disclosed to the author.

Confidential Comments to the Executive Editor

ΩSpecial Characters

*Comments to the Author

ΩSpecial Characters

Please do not scan handwritten comments – files tend to exceed 5 MG and difficult to read.

Attach Files ⓘ

Drop files here or click, to begin. (Max of 10 at a time)

Annotated Comments -- please remove identify from Properties

No Files Attached

Save often!

Save as Draft

Save & Print

Submit Review >

Once the decision is rendered to the author, the decision letter is available in your Technical Reviewer Center. You can view the completed review and the comments made by the other Technical Reviewers by clicking on the decision letter link.

View Manuscripts

Manuscripts assigned to you for review are listed in the "Review and Score" list below. You can view the manuscript by clicking on its title. To view reviewer instructions and access the score sheet, click on the "Perform Review" button.

Review and Score			
Manuscript ID	Title	Due Date	Perform Review
There are no manuscripts in this list.			

Scores Submitted				
			Manuscripts 1-10 of 17	
Manuscript ID	Title	Date Completed	Status	View Review
DC-1215-0009	The Effect of Bit Type on Reactive Torque and Consequent Toolface Control Anomalies	11-Jan-2016	ADM: Hughes, Stacie • Publishable-Minor Changes (15-Feb-2016) • a revision has been submitted Archiving completed on 31-Oct-2016 view decision letter Response to Decision Letter:	
			ADM: Parr, Coty ADM: Hughes, Stacie • Publishable-Major Changes (05-Feb-2016)	

Please contact peer@spe.org with any questions. Thank you for your continued support to SPE!