

Journal of Geodesy: Checklist for Reviewers

Manuscript ID: MS 06.014

Title: 20 years of evolution for the DORIS permanent network, from its initial deployment to its renovation

Authors: H. Fagard

Responsible Editor: P. Willis

A. Administrative Issues:

A1. Do you give permission for your identity to be known to the author(s)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, you name is: MICHAEL PEARLMAN

A2. Have you seen this paper or the same results submitted to another journal or peer-reviewed conference proceedings? ☐ Yes ☒ No

A3. You declare that you have no conflict of interest ☒ Yes ☐ No

B. Overall Recommendation:

B1. Is this manuscript of the standard that you usually expect to see in a high-quality, peer-reviewed international journal? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B2. Is the material at the forefront of geodetic research? ☒ Yes ☐ No

B3. Do you recommend publication of this manuscript outright? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B4. Do you recommend publication after revision and review by only the Responsible Editor and Editor-in-Chief? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B5. Do you recommend significant revision then re-review (you will be asked to re-review the revised manuscript)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

B6. Do you recommend rejection of this manuscript outright? ☐ Yes ☒ No

C. Presentation:

C1. Is the use of the English language both concise and clear? ☐ Yes ☒ No

C2. Are any parts of the manuscript (e.g., text, figures, tables, discussions, explanations, maths derivations) too short/long? ☒ Yes ☐ No

C3. Is the abstract brief (200-300 words), yet contains all details? ☐ Yes ☒ No

C4. Are the keywords accurate and representative for indexing? ☒ Yes ☐ No

C5. Are the figures and tables clear with self-explanatory legends? ☒ Yes ☐ No

C6. Are all the references cited and widely accessible? ☒ Yes ☐ No

C7. Can any material be moved to ESM or an appendix? ☒ Yes ☐ No

D. Detailed technical comments:

- D1. Does the manuscript contain enough new material to warrant publication in the Journal of Geodesy? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- D2. Does the introduction set the scope for the paper, e.g., give a review of the current status of the subject area? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- D3. Are any assumptions clearly and explicitly stated? ☐ Yes ☐ No *N/A*
- D4. Have you carefully checked any mathematical derivations? ☐ Yes ☐ No *N/A*
- D5. If applicable, are the mathematical derivations clear and correct? ☐ Yes ☐ No *N/A*
- D6. Are the methods used sound, clearly described and repeatable? ☐ Yes ☐ No *N/A*
- D7. Are any experiments conducted carefully with proper controls? ☐ Yes ☐ No *N/A*
- D8. Are the results/discussions presented clearly and unambiguously? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- D10. Is the discussion presented in the context of other studies? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- D11. Are the conclusions clear and based upon the results presented? ☒ Yes ☐ No

E. Electronic Supplementary Material (ESM), if applicable

- E1. Have you reviewed any ESM submitted together with the manuscript? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- E2. Do you consider the ESM submitted as a useful supplement? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Additional Comments

If you have any additional comments on the manuscript, please email them to the Responsible Editor. If you have any confidential comments that you wish to communicate only to the Editor or Editor-in-Chief, please write a separate email. Finally, many thanks for your review.

This document has a lot of historic material which should be documented, but it is too much detail for this journal. A succinct version of this would be appropriate - the figures are very complete and give a very good picture of the infrastructure and the historical evolution, but again it is too much for a journal article. This should perhaps be an internal or IDS document with a summary published in the journal. It is important to document the detail, and it is important that the community should be given a view (but just a view) of the history and the evolution. The English needs a lot of help. Things can be said in far fewer words. There are also lists (bulletized lists) -

that could be summarized in a few words. I have
tried to give some editing comments on the first
part of the document to suggest how wording could
be improved. The author needs to separate out
what is really important from detail.

I learned a lot from the manuscript, but it was too
laborious.

It might be useful to include some numbers like
orbital accuracy, station position accuracy, other
geodetic parameters and how these evolved with
time.