

Paper: “Control de calidad de las observaciones GPS de la Red Geodésica Nacional Activa en México del periodo 2020-2023”

Submitted: 19 June 2024

Accepted: 23 July 2024

Published: 31 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Rosendo Romero Andrade

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n21p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n21p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: María del Socorro Fuentes Andrade
Universidad Tecnológica de San Juan del Río (UTSJR), Querétaro, Mexico

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 27-06-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 09-07-2024
Manuscript Title: Quality control of the GPS observations of the National Geodetic Active Network in Mexico for the period 2020-2024	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 07-07-2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>There are no comments</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The information meets the requirements, however there are some errors in the syntax</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There is use of the "comma" sign in short narrative quotes, check and remove them if applicable, also write the verb in plural when talking about several authors. Some finger errors.</i>	

<i>Homogenize the font and size of the tables and ensure that they are self-adjusted within the margin of the sheet to avoid cutting off the words. Do not start with a capital letter after using the "comma" sign. Do not capitalize some words that are not proper names.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>As such, the section is not read, in some sections it is understood, therefore this section can be improved</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>There are no comments</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>There are no comments</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>In the quote from Sharma et. al., two spaces in the sign arrangement, review and correct.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: