**REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE**

Name of article:

1. Originality: Is the question original and well defined? Do the results provide an advance in current knowledge?

2. Significance: Are the results interpreted appropriately? Are they significant? Are all conclusions justified and supported by the results?

3. Quality of Presentation: Is the article written in an appropriate way? Are the data and analyses presented appropriately? Are the highest standards for presentation of the results used?

4. Scientific Soundness: is the study correctly designed and technically sound? Are the analyses performed with the highest technical standards? Are the data robust enough to draw the conclusions? Are the methods, tools, software, and reagents described with sufficient details to allow another researcher to reproduce the results?

5. Interest to the Readers: Are the conclusions interesting for the readership in the field of earth science?

6. Overall Merit: Is there an overall benefit to publishing this work? Does the work provide an advance towards the current knowledge?

7. Detail comments:

 - Name of the article: is it fully reflecting the content of the manuscript? Other comments or suggestion.

- Abstract: is it properly written in the format required by the journal (a continuous passage, no line breaks)? And is it concise, fully reflecting the purpose of the paper, research methods, and main results?

- Keywords: are they suitable for index purposes? Are there any that needed to add or remove?

- Introduction: Is it convince enough in terms of the purpose and objectives of the article? Any recommendations on addition or reduction?

- Study area involved in the article: Have the geologic, tectonic setting or seismicity characteristics been properly described? Any additional recommendations?

.- Data and research methods used: The source and reliability of the data? Are the methods used consistent with the research objectives and clearly described in the manuscript? Any suggestion on addition or reduction? Other comments?

- Are the results presented in clear, complete and reliable forms? Recommendations (?):

- Are the charts and/or tables presented in the manuscript reflecting the research findings (quantities and units, uncertainty; are the letters readable?)

- Figures: does the manuscript contains a generalized figure showing the study area? Is the resolution of the graphic illustrations good enough and is the handwriting readable?, Provide comments on legends and/or annotations of each figure, recommendations on any additions or reductions.

- Discussion: are results interpreted reasonably and radically? Are results logical and convincing and are they comparable with those, published earlier? Other comments?

- Conclusion: is it consistent with the objectives of the article? Does it summarize the main results/findings and consistent with the points made in the commentary and discussion? Any recommendations on the future’s work? Other comments and recommendations.

- References: Are the references adequate and following the format required by the journal both in the text and in the list of references? Point out those references that are lack of or unsuitable for the article.

8. English Level: Is the English language appropriate and understandable?

9. Overall Recommendation (accepted without revision, minor revision, major revision, major revision with returned review, reject):