



**Paper: “Monitorización Y Control De Calidad De Las Estaciones De La Red CGPS Topo-Iberia-UJA”**

Corresponding Author: Juan Antonio García-Armenteros

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rosendo Romero-Andrade, Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, México

Reviewer 2: Joaquin Zurutuza, University of Padova, Italy

Reviewer 3: María del Socorro Fuentes Andrade, Technological University of the Sierra Hidalguense/Mexico

Published: 31.08.2020

# 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: Joaquin Zurutuza	
University/Country: University of Padova, Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 2020/07/02	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Original: Monitoring and quality control of Topo-Iberia-UJA cGPS network Monitorización y control de calidad de la red cGPS Topo-Iberia-UJA  <b>I propose to modify it to:</b> Monitoring and quality control of the Topo-Iberia-UJA cGPS network stations Monitorización y control de calidad de las estaciones de la red cGPS Topo-Iberia-UJA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: N/A	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
The title, as provided by the author, can be misleading. The analysis is performed on the GNSS observations and the stations of the network. I suggest including this in the title, so as not to be confused with the network analysis, which is a completely different task.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
The abstract should be re-written and checked by an English speaker. I have made a few corrections, but the author should consider to write it again.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The paper is correctly written. The ideas are clearly stated, though some minor errors should be amended (see the doc file in tracking mode).	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes. Again, some details are missing (software), but after a single read, the methods, input data and results are clear.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes. Some clarifications are requested.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes. The author uses & before the name of the last co-author and even when the reference paper is of TWO authors (instead of and, as usual). If the editor accepts this sort of references, it is OK.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

In general lines, the paper is correct and deals with a major problem of GNSS networks, which is the quality control (QC) of the sites through the observation data.

The paper is interesting for any GNSS network manager interested in the QC of the observations recorded by the GNSS stations, but deals only with GPS observations. It is based on the teqc, which is not RINEX 3 ready and is not expected to be upgraded. Most modern GNSS stations provide data in RINEX 3, which is the format recommended by IGS for multiGNSS, since teqc/RINEX2 is not ready for the newest signals in space.

I very much miss that IGS style logsheets are not even mentioned and should be the backbone of any QC: all the equipment modifications and updates/upgrades are made available in the logsheet and problems, if any, can be found by a simple check. Moreover, the EUREF QC analysis, mentioned in the paper, strategy involves the logsheet-RINEX metadata validation.

I would recommend that the author writes some lines about the plans for the future QC strategy, since RINEX 2 is being replaced by RINEX 3.x, which is not teqc compatible.

One question is why only GPS is considered in this study.

I think the paper is very clearly written and could be useful for many GNSS network managers: no new results are shown, but a QC strategy, so could be published as a case study.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

## ***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:	Email:
----------------	--------

University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 07-01-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07-13-2020
Manuscript Title: Monitoring and quality control of Topo-Iberia-UJA cGPS network	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27.07.2020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>In the title in Spanish, the correct form is: Monitoreoy control de la calidad de la red cGPS Topo-Iberia-UJA</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The first part of the summary shows a long justification, make it shorter. In the objective, methods and results write the verbs put it in the past tense. Write “monitoreo” when the word is in Spanish and not monitorización.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Some accents are missing in words, example: línea, máscara and número Leave a space in (N)compress Refer more clearly to:problemas de batería</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Avoid the phrase in the data discussion: ha sido tan bueno</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>In the part: satellites with known ephemeris, clarify if they are local, national or global.</i>	

<p><i>Need to put the point to the abbreviation etc.</i></p> <p><i>Check the wording of the phrase in spanish:utilizanumeroso software y se ha procurado que seagratiso, estable y duraderoen el tiempoevitandoproblemas de licencias y caducidad.</i></p> <p><i>Check that all the figures are presented and arranged in sequence, referred to in the text and placed after being referred.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>Mention which station number was the one that caused the small detail of the data</i></p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>The reference based on the author is misspelled, instead of writing:En (Jaldehyag et al., 1996) se estudió ... writing Jaldehyag et al. (1996) estudió...</i></p> <p><i>Similarly</i></p> <p><i>(Larson &amp;Nievinski, 2013)</i></p> <p><i>(Pirti, 2008)</i></p> <p><i>(Uzodinma &amp;Nwafor, 2018)</i></p>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The work is very interesting, only improve the wording in Spanish, in some cases a bad translation is seen (if it was), in other sections the verb is used in the present tense, when it should be in the past tense, to make the fact that I already finished doing

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**