General Comments:

I write comments for a reason. Please follow them and make the appropriate corrections. You have barely addressed any comments from Draft 1. If you have questions on my comments, ask me. I'm happy to discuss as it's often hard to make good comments in purely written form.

NO ALL CAPS IN SECTION TITLES. Use normal capitalization of major words.

Your abstract and Introduction section are severely lacking in polish and content. These should both be mostly complete with reasonable level of polish.

In citations, there should be a space between the words and the cite. Make it so for all citations.

Define all acronyms on first use. Note, the abstract is NOT part of the paper proper, so you must define all acronyms on first use in the paper proper even if defined in the abstract.

In general this is written like a lab report...need to write a technical paper.

Title: DO NOT USE ALL CAPS FOR TITLE

Author: Don't need to put "Dr." in front of names. Just names is fine.

Email: Add author emails.

Abstract:

You need to write an abstract, not a series of poorly connected paragraphs.

Only 1 paragraph in the abstract.

Don't ask questions. This is not an English essay. It's a technical paper. Write formally.

\*\*\*Read and follow my presentation on how to write your abstract.\*\*\*

No citations in your abstract. If you have material you need to cite, you're writing it wrong.

"...earthquakes occurred with .89 coefficient of determination." What the heck does this mean? 89% of the time they tried to make an earthquake happen they were successful? That's pretty bad. Speak CEO NOT Geek. .89 coe... is pure geek and truly meaningless as the first sentence of your abstract...and not very meaningful even when you include that in your results. It needs explanation.

"In this {\em new\/} study..." Of course this is a new study; otherwise, you wouldn't be graduating. You're writing a paper. In this paper, we present....

"The result proves..." Actually, your result really won't prove anything. It may show or demonstrate, but not prove.

Introduction

\*\*\*Read and follow my presentation on how to write your Introduction.\*\*\*

This should be 4-8 pages in length, and it is an executive summary of your paper.

What's your one sentence problem statement? I don't find any problem statements in your Introduction.

Tutorial Material [sic] - change this name (this is a repeat comment)

Use tables to summarize the information. Need to relate the earthquakes to the data being generated. Need a new section on the LANL experiment setup.

Data

Diagram of setup would be useful. What that means??

Figure text is too small. Make it so it is readable when printed on 8.5x11 paper.

Methods and Experiments [sic] - change this title (this is a repeat comment)

Need to have background information on your methods used, particularly neural networks..

Keep all text within the box of your text. Websites should be footnoted.

Results

Results section is meant to contain results. It contains nothing but a lab report of what you did. DO NOT WRITE A LAB REPORT. Include your results in the results section.

Analysis

Figures 10 through 12 are too small to read. Use larger fonts so that they can be read. And, break them out of the tables you have put them in. The graphs are unreadable, the words are unreadable, and consequently, the graphs are useless. Even worse, they are a waste of space. Make them legible at normal scale.

Ethics

What are the ethical dilemmas you are addressing? You've got a couple potential ones, but you need to go into greater details.

Conclusion [sic - Conclusions plural] This is a repeat comment. Fix it.

"suggests that" - NEVER. Draw conclusions. Be definitive.

As you stated in your first draft "This is NOT a summary section." However, you have written a summary. Draw conclusions.

Your last paragraph is pure speculation. Do not speculate. State conclusions based upon the work you present in the paper.

-----------------------

Comments on Draft 1 - you have addressed only the most trivial of these comments.

The title is a bit odd as it doesn't really seem to mean anything. Lab earthquake analysis is something that you do. But, what is presented in this paper?

Read and watch and then follow my presentation on how to write your capstone paper.

Citations belong within the sentence containing the material you are citing. Eg "...at all times [6]." NOT "...at all times. [6]"

Abstract -

Your second sentence - remember that you are writing this as if you've already done the work, so you either did it or you didn't do it. Furthermore, "in this study we predict" should be "In this paper, we present ..."

No citations within the abstract. Rewrite so citations are not necessary.

Your statements of what you do are too generic. And, your abstract is not a summary of what you did, it's an executive summary of your paper.

We will work on this...

Introduction -

Define all acronyms on first use....what is LANL?

Your Introduction is a 2-4 page (6-7 paragraph) executive summary of your paper. Read and follow my presentation on how to write.

What is a "laboratory earthquake"? You should start by defining this, including its relationship to real earthquakes, before you get to the LANL work.

Don't use quotes within your Introduction. These detract from the story you are trying to tell. They make it very hard to understand what you are doing. You don't even properly introduce the quotes. They are simply presented without context. Quotes are used only to show a point, not to be used as part of your story.

Tutorial Material -

"Tutorial Material" is a horrible title. Make it descriptive.

Is "Regular Earthquake" a standard term in the industry or just your term? If it is your term, don't use it. Use the standard terms, eg stick-slip earthquake, to refer to these.

"We hear about..." Write formally and just the facts. Start with your second sentence - Earthquakes are stick-slip events that ... You understand that your definition of Regular Earthquakes applies to Slow Slip Earthquakes too ? Slow slip earthquakes DO SHAKE THE GROUND! However, the shaking is generally not noticeable by humans or significant enough to cause damage.

You really need to have better definitions and descriptions of earthquakes. Your stick-slip definition does not appear to be correct on its face.

"This study analyzes..." What your study does is NOT "Tutorial Information" and does not belong in this section.

No subsections are needed in what you have written.

Need to define "fault" (you have defined "fault line" but not "fault").

You write too informally and abstractly. Write formally and specifically. eg "Regular earthquakes [sic] are caused by a sudden slip on a fault." What's a slip? Isn't that usually followed by a fall? Or is that small piece of paper?

"get stuck at their edges due to friction" - what's an "edge"? And, is this truly friction or something else?

You really need to have a section on the geography of tectonic plates and how they move past one another. then you can be talking intelligently (to the reader) about how their motion causes earthquakes.

Lab earthquakes should be a section unto itself.

You have not provided enough information on the LANL work for the reader to understand what they did. You need to describe their experiments in some detail as well as their analysis techniques and results so that the reader can understand it.

Data -

Should have a table that clearly identifies and defines the attributes, eg a two column table with Attribute and Definition of Attribute columns.

The figures are placed in all the wrong places. You need to introduce the data before you start showing figures of data. The figures are likely valuable, but they are all placed without sufficient definition and description within the text. You MUST tell the reader what you want them to understand from each figure and table. Do not make the reader think or assume that they will look at a figure and pull the same information from it that you pull out of it.

Figures -

In general, your figures use fonts that are too small and too hard to read. Use larger fonts and better figure visualization design approaches. Ask yourself what you want the reader to understand from each figure. If that is not understandable within 1 second and without any thought, then your figure has likely failed to convey the desired information. Similarly tables, although many tables are actually meant to be studied, so they have a different set of rules.

Your captions are generally too long and not useful for understanding what is being presented in the figures. If you have to put values in the captions to make a figure understandable, then your figure is a failure (see, e.g., Fig. 4).

Fig 5 caption - "We checked how both..." Write formally. This is commentary and poor writing. "evaluated" and "analyzed" are both much better descriptions of what you did.

Conclusion [sic - should be "Conclusions"]

References

Your References are not correct as they are all missing significant information. Use BibTeX for your references. It will force you to have all the information and put it in the correct format for you.