

# Review of: "Some Possibilities of Increasing the Completeness of Oil and Gas Recovery"

Tibor Krenicky<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Technical University in Kosice

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This contribution is a summary of many years of knowledge and experience in gas and oil recovery in selected locations, especially EOR. The form of the article is more of an overview, so it is like a chapter of a scientific monograph, or a smaller specialized monograph, or a qualifying final thesis.

From a scientific point of view, the contribution brings useful information in broader contexts, but the quantitative scope lacks a focus on a more specific goal of the solution.

On the formal side, I propose the following adjustments:

Improve the quality and unify image formats. 1, 14-17, Fig. 2-1ap, Fig. 1-ap. 2, etc.

Fig. 3 describes the pressure distribution after killing well 3, but I'm not sure that the term "killing of the well" is the most appropriate - I recommend considering a reformulation. Also, in that figure, it is not clear whether the x-axis is linear or logarithmic.

In the description of Fig. 8, it is not clear how models 5 and 6 are defined. Why are models 1 to 3 not presented? Why is model 4 presented only in Fig. 11, so the models are not sorted in ascending order?

Different formats of literature citation are used - e.g., on page 28, [Wikipedia, 2021] is used, but also [4].

For many pictures taken from books, the given source is missing (e.g., 14, 15, etc.).

In fig. 17, the designation of the y-axis is given in the alphabet.

In several places of the text, but especially in the tables, quantities with subscripts are listed without using subscript formatting.

Several images are presentation slides, which is quite unconventional for the given form of articles, but they fulfil the informational function. However, it would also be advisable to unify text formatting within them.

The nomenclature needs to be supplemented with other used symbols and abbreviations, and I also recommend considering moving this part to the beginning of the article.

The numbering of the equations needs to be unified, e.g., (I, 1ap.) should be (1, 1ap.).