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The paper has been written as a technical report, needs to be rewritten, and it should be clear what they want to solve. Likewise, its results should be presented in terms of a characterization of seismic site effects as a preliminary step for quantification studies of seismic hazard. Some remarks

1. An abstract summarizes, usually in one paragraph of 300 words or less, the major aspects of the entire paper in a prescribed sequence that includes: 1) the overall purpose of the study and the research problem(s) you investigated; 2) the basic design of the study; 3) major findings or trends found as a result of your analysis; and, 4) a brief summary of your interpretations and conclusions (See https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/abstract#:

2. The goal of the study is not clear. 3. The section Introduction must be focusing in describe the importance of know the subsoil seismic response in areas with the absence of seismic studies and what methodologies are recommended applied. 3. Is it necessary to change the focus of the geological framework section to a seismotectonic framework only for southern Mexico. 4. Section Previous studies. The text is meaningless, in this section I recommend to authors focus on the interest area, they should describe the general context of the seismic hazard in southern Mexico, and the information available about seismic site effects. Is not necessary to describe aspects of all Mexico that not will be used later. 5. Section location. Rewrite. 6. Section and methods. Is needed to describe why you use MASV technique in this study. 7. It is necessary to make a correlation of the results with geotechnical information and geological information.
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