



Paper: “Análisis Comparativo Del Posicionamiento GNSS Utilizando Receptor De Bajo Costo U-Blox De Doble Frecuencia Para Aplicaciones Topógrafo-Geodésicas”

Corresponding Author: Rosendo Romero-Andrade

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p289

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antonio Herrera Olmo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Jose Joaquin Vila Ortega, Universidad del Quindío. Colombia

Reviewer 4: C. Luis Enrique Acosta González Holguín, Cuba

Published: 30.09.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Jose Joaquin Vila Ortega	Email:
University/Country: Universidad del Quindío. Colombia	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: 19-08-2020	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0905/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(The title is clear and it fits the content of the article, however it is not clear what kind of analysis was done (Statistical, comparative, etc)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The summary should show more clearly the subject of the analysis and not just the data collection procedures in the field.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>es, there are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. For example, on the page 6 the gender of the noun does not coincide with the conjugation of the verb.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Although possible influences of errors are discussed in detail, it is not clear to propose other sampling dates, since with so few days in different periods the results can be good by coincidence and not by the methodology of the post-process.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>However, there are conclusions that are not supported based on the study, for example when saying that it is comparable with geodesic equipment for distances greater than 20 km and the upper limit which would be? I think they mean less than 20 km)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes, they are appropriate and from very recent times, which shows a good bibliographic search</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): *It would be good to clarify the conditions of the analysis, to show well the equal parameters of comparison and to clarify that it is a comparative analysis of results. Review and support the conclusions on the minimum distance of use of these low-cost equipment.*

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 08-19-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 08-29-2020
Manuscript Title: GNSS positioning analysis using low-cost dual frequency U-Blox receiver for topographer-geodetic applications	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is clear, but when referring to a particular case, at the end of it, it should be written: Case study in Sinaloa, Mexico</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results, only in the objects to talk about the study area</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<p><i>Only one spelling detail was found (an accent is missing in a proper noun), some details in the grammar, example: checking the verb in the time that the action executed or to be executed is reported. Consider the correct time symbol based on the International System of Units.</i></p> <p><i>But the errors that are in abundance are those of presentation, when using the equation editor they left empty spaces, those referring to superscripts or subscripts. Also in the tables when distributing their data, several of them were in different rows.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, it is recommended that the Tables are not cut into more than one page and that the headings of these are not so extended.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>The methods are not clearly explained, because that subtitle is not written, it can be believed that after presenting the objective and it appears written "Precise Point Positioning and Relative Static" or later where it is written "Case study", this lack of clarity confuses the reader. It is also a fairly long section, it is suggested that the authors be more concise.</i></p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<p><i>It is an interesting work, but they show it in a disorderly way, there is no clarity in some sections (the methods section has already been mentioned), it is suggested to join the results and discussion section and show only the necessary results</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p><i>The conclusions are supported by the results only correct the aforementioned details of grammar and short references</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<p><i>The short citations throughout the document have details, they are not homogeneous, for example when they write: Author's Surname et al., (Year) sometimes omit the comma, others omit the period (considering that it is an abbreviation) and get confused when they refer to the author at the beginning of the citation: Author et al. (Year) or Author (Year) no longer has to carry the punctuation mark of the "comma".</i></p> <p><i>The references section shows the state of the art of the work, all are recent; just check them again, some have minor details, for example, the month appears on the publication date or the volume is missing on others.</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Present the work in fewer pages and consider all the comments made.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Luis Enrique Acosta González	
University/Country: Holguín, Cuba	
Date Manuscript Received: 9/09/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/09/20
Manuscript Title: GNSS positioning analysis using low-cost dual frequency U-Blox receiver for topographer-geodetic applications	
pt Number: ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print)	e - ISSN 1857- 7431
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(You can improve the writing, to avoid repeating words. As well as mention the case study where the experimentation is carried out.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(However, you should review the wording, with respect to the words repeated in the same paragraph)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(You should review some suggestions, which are pointed out in the body of the article)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): *You should review some suggestions, which are pointed out in the body of the article*