Yêu thích
Tran Danh Hung
Hộp thư đến 164
Mục Đã gửi
bm_dvl 346
BM ĐVL 2
KDT 25
PTH
Khoa Dầu Khí 6
Planner 50
Các công việc của bộ... 8
Dep. Geophysics 7
Bộ môn Địa vật lý 25
GROUP TẤT CẢ CÁ... 12
ALL VIÊN CHỨC HU... 23
CÁN BỘ CHỦ CHỐT ... 1
Thêm nội dung yêu thích

Thư mục
Hộp thư đến 164
Thư nháp 1
Mục Đã gửi
Mục Đã xoá 21
Thư rác 227
Archive1
Ghi chú
Conversation History
KKT61-DC62
SEG 451
SSA 77
Tạo thư mục mới

Nhóm
bm_dvl 346
ALL VIÊN CHỨC HU... 23
CÁN BỘ CHỦ CHỐT ... 1
Bộ môn Địa vật lý 25
GROUP TẤT CẢ CÁ... 12
Xem thêm
Nhóm mới
Khám phá các nhóm
Quản lý nhóm

Đóng | Trước đó | Tiếp theo

Frontiers: Thank you for submitting your Independent Review Report! - 1025110

Dịch thư sang: Tiếng Việt | Không bao giờ dịch từ: Tiếng Anh

Frontiers Earth Science Editorial Office <earthscience.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>
Tới: Tran Danh Hung ĐVL
T2 12/09/2022 02:03

Dear Dr Hung,

Frontiers Earth Science Editorial Office has sent you a message. Please click 'Reply' to send a direct response

Thank you for submitting your independent review report for the manuscript "Estimation of the gas hydrate saturation from multichannel seismic data on the western continental margin of the Chukchi Rise in the Arctic Ocean". The handling editor has been notified, and you can find a copy of your report below.

You will be informed once the interactive review process is activated, to allow direct discussion with the authors. Until this next stage, you can still modify your report if you have any outstanding comments.
You can access your report and the manuscript online using the following link:
http://www.frontiersin.org/Review/EnterReviewForum.aspx?activationno=463b3b11-816c-4fb0-bd84-e8f355881bf2&retab=3

To familiarize yourself further with the Frontiers review guidelines:
http://www.frontiersin.org/Journal/ReviewGuidelines.aspx?s=1552&name=earth_and_planetary_materials

Best regards,

Your Frontiers in Earth Science team

Frontiers | Editorial Office - Collaborative Peer Review Team
www.frontiersin.org
Avenue du Tribunal Fédéral 34, 1005 Lausanne, Switzerland
Office T 41 21 510 17 93

For technical issues, please contact our IT Helpdesk (support@frontiersin.org)

Manuscript title: Estimation of the gas hydrate saturation from multichannel seismic data on the western continental margin of the Chukchi Rise in the Arctic Ocean
Manuscript ID: 1025110
Authors: Yeonjin Choi, Seung-Goo Kang, Young Keun Jin, Jong Kuk Hong, Sung-Ryul Shin, Sookwan Kim, Youngil Choi
Journal: Frontiers in Earth Science, section Earth and Planetary Materials
Article type: Original Research
Submitted on: 22 Aug 2022
Edited by: Luan Thanh Pham

Research Topic: The Use of Geosciences for Exploring and Predicting Natural Resources

---
Independent Review Report, Reviewer: Tran Danh Hung

EVALUATION
Please list your revision requests for the authors and provide your detailed comments, including highlighting limitations and strengths of the study and evaluating the validity of the methods, results, and data interpretation. If you have additional comments based on Q2 and Q3 you can add them as well.
This manuscript presents estimates of the gas hydrate saturation from seismic reflection data on the western continental margin of the Chukchi Rise in the Arctic Ocean. These two seismic profiles MCS03 and MCS04 used for interpreting have good quality. The raw seismic shot-gathers extracted from the MCS03 show a BSR (polarity-reversed reflections). The data and methods used are consistent with high reliability.
The gas hydrate saturation model can be constructed by comparing the calculated seismic velocity with the true velocity extracted from the gas hydrate zone. The low-velocity anomaly suggests the presence of free gas, and the high-velocity anomalies indicate a gas hydrate-bearing sediment zone. Finally, the authors used the EMT model to construct gas hydrate saturation models from the seismic P-wave velocity model for MCS03 and MCS04.
Points for improvements:
1. Table 1. Elastic modulus and density of sediment: Line 2 with typo the unit of density is (?, g/m3) instead of (?, g/cm3);
2. I suggest further improvement in the writing, particularly in the abstract and conclusions.
3. Overall, this article is of good quality that can be published after fixing a few minor errors.
Check List
a. Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?
Yes
b. Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?