Review of: "The Comparison of Traverses Adjusted by Non-Rigorous and Rigorous Methods of Adjustment"

Dáša Bačová[1]

1 University of Zilinska

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The present paper presents a study concerning the long-discussed issue of traverses in surveying practice and the approach to the measurement of polygon strokes.

In terms of professionalism, a number of unprofessional terms appear in the text. Sentences containing professional and technical terms and descriptions are in places merged with fictionalized phrases that in some places degrade the level and perspective of the article. It is not forbidden to use metaphors even in technical engineering articles, but it is important to set a limit.

In terms of expertise and specificity, the article lacks the following:

- Instrument data (accuracy of measurement of angles and lengths, etc.);

- data on the accuracy of the FUTO001 and FUTO003 reference points (what is their intrinsic accuracy or by what method was their accuracy determined? Are they points with forced centring of the instrument? If not, what centring method was used and what was the accuracy of the centring over the point?);

- a graphical representation of the situation - the constellation of measurements (angles, lengths, orientation...);

- method of centering over other points stabilized by wooden stakes - photo from the field with stabilization marks missing;

- Was a tripod system with dependent centering used? ;

- How was the change in horizontal position of the tripods after loading with the apparatus instead of a reflecting prism addressed?

- Data on the meteorological conditions of the measurement time interval are missing.

- Were corrections made to the measured quantities to reduce the influence of atmospheric conditions?

- The Materials and Methods section lacks a description of the measurement equilibration approach or references to the computational and equilibration approaches used.

Overall, I rate the idea of the paper as very beneficial, but the processing of the paper and the presentation of the outputs are of a lower standard. By completing the missing information and graphical representations (whether of the

measurement situation, the observed shifts, the mean error ellipses...) I would consider the article informative and beneficial.