

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

Joseph Donfack¹

¹ Federal Bureau of Investigation

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting article comparing two methods to adjust traverse measurements. Overall, the article is well written, but few areas of the manuscript require further clarifications or reorganization.

ABSTRACT

1. The authors claim the transit technique significantly outperformed the rigorous technique. The authors should state by how many folds or state if the difference is statistically significant by assigning a p-value to the difference.

RESULTS

1. There's a Figure 4.1 without a Figure 1.
2. Figure 4.1 axes should be labeled (x = Station points, y = Adjusted coordinates, also indicate a unit, if any)

DISCUSSION

1. Suggest moving the first paragraph of the Discussion to Materials and Methods.
2. Suggest moving the second and third paragraph to Results and Discussion
3. Create a Conclusion section
4. "From the graph and ..." Is the authors referring to Figure 4.1?
5. "Also, by subtracting coordinates of Bowditch and Transit method from Least Squares...had a higher value of 0.137395" Is that number has a unit?

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The authors list references at the end of the manuscript but none appear in the main manuscript body. It is customary to cite the sources of statements made that are not the authors when writing a manuscript. Ideas or facts taken from outside source must be cited in the manuscript main body. Exceptions are facts or general statements that are common knowledge.
2. "Moore R. E" does not appear in the reference list.
3. The "Results" section should be "Results and discussion" and create a "Conclusion" section.

