

Zimbra

damien.pageot@ifsttar.fr

Geophysical Journal International - GJI-16-0524.R2

De : Geophysical Journal International
<onbehalf+sh+ras.org.uk@manuscriptcentral.com>

jeu., 11 mai 2017 11:12

 1 pièce jointe

Expéditeur : onbehalf+sh+ras.org.uk
<onbehalf+sh+ras.org.uk@manuscriptcentral.com>

Objet : Geophysical Journal International - GJI-16-0524.R2

À : damien pageot <damien.pageot@ifsttar.fr>

Répondre à : sh@ras.org.uk

Dear Dr. Pageot

We have now received reviews of your revised manuscript GJI-16-0524.R2 entitled "Improving the seismic small-scale modeling by comparison with numerical methods". These are appended, together with any additional comments from the editor. Taking these reviews into account, the Editor, Dr. Lapo Boschi, feels that some further, moderate revision of your manuscript is required, after which we will be pleased to give further consideration to publication in Geophysical Journal International.

You now have THREE months in which to submit your revision, but we hope that you will be able to make the necessary revisions well within that time. Your revision is due by 09-Aug-2017.

If you do not submit a revised version of your manuscript within three months it will be deemed withdrawn. We would be happy to consider your revised version after that date, but it will be handled as a new submission. In any event, you should quote the reference number of this manuscript.

You should submit your revised version, together with your response to the reviewer's comments via the Geophysical Journal International site <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/gji>.

Enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript reference will be appended to denote a revision.

IMPORTANT: do NOT submit your revised manuscript as a new paper UNLESS you have exceeded the three-month deadline.

We must be in possession of all source files in a .tar file before your paper can be accepted. Please be sure to upload both a file containing your complete manuscript (PDF, PS, WORD etc) and a .tar file containing separate source files of all text (LaTeX etc.),

figures (tif, gif, eps, etc.), tables etc. for use by the publisher. Failure to do so will almost certainly result in delays later. Your complete manuscript file should be designated as a Complete manuscript file, including figures and tables (PDF, PS or DOC); your .tar file as Files NOT for review (source files - .zip or .tar.gz).

You will not be able to make your revisions to the originally submitted files of the manuscript held on ScholarOne Manuscripts. Instead, you must delete any original files and abstract you have changed and replace them with your revised files. Check that any requests for colour publication or online-only publication are correct. Proof read the resulting PDF and HTML files that are generated carefully.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer in the space provided. You should also use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer. Changes to the manuscript should be highlighted (e.g. in bold or colour), to assist the referee and editor. Authors should also upload clean files (remove bold font or track changes) for the publisher, since uncorrected versions of accepted manuscripts are now immediately published online ahead of the proof corrected versions.

Regards,

Miss Sylvia Hales
Geophysical Journal International

Editor

Dear authors,
the review process for this manuscript has been more difficult than usual, as the two initial referees expressed quite different opinions. One referee recommended first a major revision, and then rejection of your paper, and refused to review your second revision. I therefore decided to send the manuscript to a third referee who believes in the scientific value of the paper but asks for some corrections of its form. Let me suggest that you do revise the paper according to the referee's indications, or in case you disagree, clearly explain why. Once this is done, I will be careful to process the revised manuscript expeditely.
Thanks for your patience!
best wishes,
Lapo

Reviewer: 1

The revised manuscript GJI-16-0524.R2 entitled "Improving the seismic small-scale modeling by comparison with numerical methods" has been modified following most of the comments and points raised previously by the two reviewers. This new version tends towards an optimal version.

Nevertheless, in order to improve the clarity and the structure of the paper, I would recommend to shorten/rewritten some parts of the paper, for instance the section Methods, more specifically the subsections 2.1. and 2.2., or at least avoid redundancies which make the sections unclear (see pages 8 and 9, for instance). Re-organizing the content of the sections will allow to better convey the objectives of the work presented here and to better put in light the new and interesting results. Moreover, I find Tables 1 & 2 not useful, and in Table 3 are included properties of materials which are not considered in the work and in the paper. Please consider to remove them. Legend of Figure 1 is not correct, compared to the associated illustration. There are still some small typos and writing mistakes (e.g., page 5 line 132, page 7 line 209, page 8 line 215...). In addition, some of the references are incomplete (e.g., Cristini & Komatitsch 2012, Favretto-Cristini et al. 2013 --- > I could not find this reference. Is it rather this publication from the same authors: Tantsereva et al. 2014 Geophysics 79?, Moczo et al. 2011, Tromp et al. 2008 ...). In conclusion, the authors have to check carefully the whole text.

The topic of this paper is definitely of great importance, but I recommend moderate revision of the paper (instead of minor revision), in order to provide sufficient time for the authors to make appropriate corrections for a nice paper at the final step.

Reviewer: 2

See attached file.



review_r2_dp.pdf

37 ko
