Feedback on Version 2

- The opening is good, where explainations on the characters are well put together in a simple, concise and credible manner
- The funnel between the opening and the challenge however might need some revision, where the paragraph highlighting the knowledge gap could be more concise
- The ending of the introduction could also be improved, as mentioned in the comments. The first sentence of the last paragraph could be used to end the introduction, and the tangent into seismology may be better suited in the Methods section
- Some clarifications into the locations of the seismic sensors could give a bit more context
- I think the presentation of the results were good, it was simple and concise
- The discussion was overall also good. However, some explainations and indepth explainations could improve this section, and connect better with the results presented

Exercise 4.2: OCAR

The opening is good as mentioned in the above list, however the challenge become a bit lengthy, and could be more concise. The majority of the last paragraph in the introduction might also be better in the Methods section, giving it a smother transition from challenge to action

How the results were presented felt simple, credible and concise. However, some expansion in the discussion would better explain some of the results presented.

Exercise 5.2: Opening

Mentioned before, opening is good. Gives a good explaination into the subject and is quite concrete.

Exercise 6.2: Funnel

The transition from the opening and the challenges could maybe be improved by keeping the knowledge gap more concise and remove redundant information