Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2018-13-EC1, 2018

Geoscientific Instrumentation Methods and Data Systems Discussions

Interactive comment on "Backpropagation Neural Network as Earthquake Early Warning Tool using a new Elementary Modified Levenberg–Marquardt Algorithm to minimise Backpropagation Errors" *by* Jyh-Woei Lin et al.

L.V. Eppelbaum (Editor)

levap@post.tau.ac.il

Received and published: 4 August 2018

Dear Editors,

I have browsed through the articles of the Geoscientific Instrumentation, Methods and Data Systems Journal. A paper called "Backpropagation Neural Network as Earthquake Early Warning Tool using a new Elementary Modified Levenberg–Marquardt Algorithm to minimise Backpropagation Errors" [1] caught my attention.

It seems the interactive discussion is closed for non authors, therefore this mail. Is it

already accepted? I would strongly recommend to have a more in-depth look at this paper for the following reasons:

+ The paper appears unscientific

+ The author self-references to a Journal (Hikari) where the author is one of the only contributors. I would not consider the author's papers from this Journal [2][3], which are referenced throughout their submitted paper, as peer-reviewed nor scientifically strong.

+ The Journal Hikari, which I am not familiar with, appears on Beall's List of predatory publishers. [4]

+ It is not a good paper!

+ The paper is unstructured and the sentences are overly complex, which makes the paper incomprehensible

+ Some sentences do not even make sense.

+ It does not get clear what they want to show. What is their contribution?

+ Instead of explaining everything in their paper, they refer to their previous publication, which is not (!) enlightening and of similar poor quality.

+ The figures are of poor quality, results cannot not be deduced from the figures.

+ Content

+ There is no evidence that their method is better! It is not even clear if it is "their" method

+ They state that they have a better predictive error: They never show values.

+ They do not accurately explain how they train their network (What is their input size? what is the output? how many samples are predicted?)

+ They do not follow the basic principles of training of a neural network (training set,

test set). At least it does not become clear.

+ Prediction of time series data is complex. I do not believe that they can predict microseismic data with a two layer ANN and it does not become clear from the paper how they can do it.

In general, please recommend to your reviewers that they provide a short summary of what they understood from the paper. I do not want to imply that they did not understand the content but it makes it a more thorough review.

[1] https://www.geosci-instrum-method-data-syst-discuss.net/gi-2018-13/

[2] http://www.m-hikari.com/asms/asms2017/asms1-2017/p/linASMS1-2017-2.pdf

[3] http://www.m-hikari.com/asms/asms2017/asms1-2017/p/linASMS1-2017.pdf

[4] https://beallslist.weebly.com/

Best,

Matthias Meyer

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2018-13, 2018.