

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_77855
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Crustal Deformation in Earthquake Process
Type of the Article	Review (Narrative or traditional literature review)

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript has the grammatical mistake. Try proofreading it. Improve the keywords, add some more keywords. The subheading is too many, challenging for the reader to novel the manuscript There are chances of high similarity from the internet sources; please revise and rephrase The figure is relatively poor quality; also, please refer or avoid if it is from outsourcing. Better refer to it in that case A flow chart will be helpful for the readers to summarize the study in a nutshell.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript have been re-edited and grammatical mistakes have been removed.2. The keywords are six, which is acceptable to AJGER.3. The subheads have been reduced. Crustal deformation, which was formally the second subhead has been eliminated and its content is merged with the methods of crustal deformation assessment (Section 2). Also, optical imaging, thermal imaging, and radar imaging, which were 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3 respectively have been merged under imaging sensors (2.2.1)4. Similarity check have been conducted using plagiarism checker X.5. The figure has been expunged.6. Actually, a flow chart will be helpful for the readers to summarize the study in a nutshell. However, I choose not to insert a flow chart.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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