

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJR2P_110915
Title of the Manuscript:	Double-Difference Method for Relocating the Hypocenter of Aftershock Earthquakes in Seririt Singaraja
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The title is suitable. However, check the following title "Utilization of Double-Difference Method for Relocating the Hypocenter of Aftershock Earthquakes in Seririt Singaraja" 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, there should be a section regarding the seismotectonics of the study area. 5. Some modification is required in the manuscript before commenting on the scientific correctness of the manuscript. 6. The references: "Hidayat, W., Sahara, D. P., Widiyantoro, S., Putra, I. P. R. A., Shihab, N. H., Amalia, R., & Harisandi, A. (2021, October). Analysis of Hypocenter Relocation by Using Double Difference Method in a Deep Underground Mining. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 873, No. 1, p. 012099). IOP Publishing." Is required. Please check 7. The line number is missing from the Manuscript. So mentioning a particular line is difficult during the review process. 8. In the Abstract the degree symbol (°) is missing while referring to locations. 9. The magnitude of the main shocks is not mentioned in the abstract. 10. Citation for the Geiger method is required which is not given in the Research Methods 1st Paragraph. 11. The last sentence in paragraph 2 of the Research Methods section "If the arrival time T, earthquake i, k seismic station can be expressed using ray theory as an integral path along the ray with the formula" is confusing. 12. No proper Legends are there in any of the Figures. It is better to add the legends in the figure besides in the text. 13. The authors mention the term "RMS". How this "RMS" value is determined? Is needed to be included in the manuscript. 14. The authors did not mention the range of the "RMS" value for Figure 2(b) Histogram of RMS residual time values after relocation. 15. Figure 2(b): it is better to put 1×10^{-3}, 3×10^{-3} etc. or it looks confusing. 16. In the entire manuscript degree symbol (°) is missing while referring to locations. 17. No proper legend is in Figure 5. It is impossible to find how big the red circle should be to call it as >4. And what is the scale of the magnitude? Is it Mw, mb or ML? 18. Latitude and Longitude are absent on the Border of the Map, which are important to identify the study area's location. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>19. The authors mentioned about 85 stations. Authors should show the location of these stations on a map along with the study area.</p> <p>20. Section 3.2 first paragraph: what is 11498 South Latitude? Is it correct</p> <p>21. Figure 5 is mentioned before Figure 4. Where is Figure 3?</p> <p>22. In Section 3.1 it is mentioned that the number of Earthquake events is 174. However in the conclusion it is mentioned that the number is 152. how?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is not suitable. Lots of modification is required. In lots of places, sentences are incomplete suddenly ". ." is coming making it hard to read.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript requires significant improvement in its writing. There are instances where 'full stops' appear abruptly. The figures, especially the maps, need substantial modification. The author should illustrate the seismotectonics of the study area, focusing on the locations of the faults. The sentences in the research methods section need careful review; please read them thoroughly. After Equation 6, 'Pesicek et al. (2010)' is mentioned, and the formatting of the citation is different there. The manuscript requires thorough improvement before any decision regarding the acceptance of the work can be made.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niranjan Borah
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology, India