

## ***Interactive comment on “Geosystemics and Earthquakes” by Angelo De Santis et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 31 January 2018

Dear editor

I have reviewed this (mostly unchanged) manuscript last year for a different journal and recommended rejection due to significant problems. I have outlined the problems in my review that is attached. A quick glance shows that the authors have changed their introduction but the scientific description is basically unchanged although I have pointed out large problems.

Therefore, I am not willing to spend more time on reviewing another submission of the manuscript if the authors are not willing to spend their time on improving their manuscript. Receiving reviews from others and ignoring them is unfair to others who have put work into reading and reviewing the authors' work. It is undermining the review process if the content of reviews is completely ignored. Why should reviewers spend their time on reporting problems in detail if authors choose to simply resubmit to

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



another journal without even taking the critique into account?

Furthermore, as can be seen in my attached review, I have pointed out how earthquake precursor studies should be conducted and that basically each of the outlined five steps is missing in this manuscript. The irony in this resubmission is that the authors have included this outline in their manuscript (5-point bullet list on page 6) without addressing the five points at all.

In conclusion, I can, again, only recommend rejection of this manuscript and urge the authors to rethink their manuscript in the light of my and possibly others' reviews.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-120/se-2017-120-RC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-120>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

