

## Reports on Geodesy and Geoinformatics

Please do not fill in and submit this PDF as your review. The final review should be sent only via **electronic form** available in Editorial System.

### 1. Do you have Conflict of Interest?

- No  
 Yes

### 2. Is the subject of the article within the scope of the journal?

- Within scope  
 Marginal  
 Outside scope

### 3. Originality

Are the problems discussed in the article new?  
Does the article point out differences from related research?  
Is the paper topical and original enough?

- Good  
 Average  
 Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

### 4. Significance

Does the article have a considerable contribution to a certain area of research?  
Does the article stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?

- Good  
 Average  
 Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

### 5. Methodology

Are the methods used clearly explained?  
Are the methods used validated / recognized?  
Are the data and statistics used reliable?

- Good  
 Average  
 Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

### 6. Title

Does the title of the paper reflect its content?

Do the title and abstract together give an adequate summary of the paper and mention the key concepts and conclusions?

- Yes
- No (needs improvements, details provided below)

**7. Abstract**

Does the abstract describe the research and the results?  
Does the abstract provide a good perspective on the final message of the article?

- Good
- Average
- Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

**8. Introduction**

Does the introduction of the paper describes the problem within a theoretical framework?

- Good
- Average
- Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

**9. Conclusions**

Do the conclusions adequately reflect the work reported?  
Are the conclusions correctly / logically explained?

- Good
- Average
- Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

**10. Quality of references**

Do the references reflect the latest work/research in the considered area?  
Are the references correctly indicated in the article and in the correct format?  
Are the source cited original, authoritative, important, and recent?

- Good
- Average
- Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

**11. Presentation**

Does the article have a logic structure?  
Is the article clearly written?  
Does the paper include a good balance of illustrations and/or tables?  
Is the submission complete (including all figures, figure captions and tables)?

## Review form

- Good
- Average
- Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

### 12. Language

The use of the English is concise and clear?  
How would you rate the quality of the English?

- Good
- Acceptable after minor editing
- Poor (needs improvements, details provided below)

### 13. If you are recommending major revisions, may we send you the revised manuscript to review?

- Yes
- No

### 14. Final decision: Is the paper acceptable for publication?

- In the present form
- With minor revisions (no re-review needed)
- With major revisions (re-review needed)
- No (reject)

### 15. Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor

### 16. Reviewer Blind Comments to Author