

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_114146
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Geodetic Control Network in Anambra State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript appears to be of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly in the fields of land surveying. Geodetic control networks are crucial for delineating boundaries and constructing infrastructures. The title is generally suitable for the study, as it reflects the content and purpose of the research. I have commented in the manuscript to add the word "passive" since geodetic control can be active or passive. Active geodetic network utilizes GNSS to accurately determine the position of points while passive geodetic network has a static position containing fixed coordinates over time. The abstract provided is generally informative and conveys the main points of the study effectively. However, I suggested some points to improve in the methods and result such as computing the relative accuracy of the output to validate if the geodetic control stations did not slightly move or the coordinates did not change. Introduction and related literature sections can be separated. Also, if the determination of the relative accuracy is not possible this time, you can put it in the recommendation section. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. If there is a quantification as to the accuracy of the output, it would be a more convincing study. Sources used in the study are recent. I suggested in the manuscript to be consistent with the format of the references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality of the article may need some improvement for scholarly communication. I have incorporated my corrections in the manuscript. The author may accept it.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is relevant and useful to the scientific community.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arturo G. Cauba Jr
Department, University & Country	Caraga State University, Philippines