DCMI OCS (Open Conference System)

PEER REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

Peer Review System

- DCMI uses the Open Conference System (OCS) for the conference website and managing the peer review process

- You will receive an email notification from the OCS for <u>each</u> review assigned to you

- Each of you already has an account on the OCS. If you need assistance logging in, contact Stuart Sutton (sasutton@uw.edu)

- The following pages describe the six steps in the review process

Review Request Email

- For <u>each</u> assigned review, you will receive a <u>separate email</u> notification with the subject line: "[DC-2012] Paper Review Request"

- The request email contains the following information:
  - Title and abstract of the submission (bottom of email)
  - The due-date for the review (30 days from date of the request email)
  - A direct URL to the individual submission *(although you can see all of your assigned submissions by logging into your current OCS account)*
  - An **important request** that you click the submission link within one week of receiving the request email and complete Step #1 by accepting/declining the individual review request

Example "review request" email

[DC-2012] Paper Review Request

Stuart A. Sutton [sasutton@uw.edu]

To: Stuart Sutton

Dear Stuart A. Sutton:

I believe that you would serve as an excellent reviewer of the proposal, "Leveraging the DDI Model for Linked Statistical Data in the Social, Behavioural, and Economic Sciences," which has been submitted to International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications. The submission's extract is inserted below, and I hope that you will consider undertaking this important task for us.

Please log into the conference web site by 2012-04-22 to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation. The web site is http://dcevents.dublincore.org/index.php/IntConf/dc-2012

The review itself is due 2012-05-13.

Submission URL:
http://dcevents.dublincore.org/index.php/IntConf/dc-2012/reviewer/submission/231

Thank you for considering this request.

If you have difficulty logging in, please contact Stuart Sutton at sasutton@uw.edu.

Stuart A. Sutton
Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (DCMI)
sasutton@uw.edu

"Leveraging the DDI Model for Linked Statistical Data in the Social, Behavioural, and Economic Sciences"

Abstract
Experts from the statistical domain worked in close collaboration with ontology engineers to develop an ontology of a subset of the Data Documentation Initiative, an established international standard for the documentation and management of data from the social, behavioral, and economic sciences. Experts in the statistics domain formulated use cases which are seen as most significant to solve frequent problems. Various benefits for the Linked Data and the statistics community as well are connected with an RDF representation of the developed ontology. In the main part of the paper, the DDI conceptual model, the mapping to the formal model, as well as implementations are explained in detail.

International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications DC-2012, Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia
http://dcevents.dublincore.org/index.php/IntConf/dc-2012/index

Step Summary

- **Steps 1&2:** Review guidelines and <u>accept or decline</u> the review assignment within one week of receiving the review request email (this is extremely important since declined assignments may need to be reassigned)

- **Step 3:** Download and review the submission file

- **Step 4:** Enter the text of your review in the provided review form and save the text

- [**Step 5:** *Do not use* the upload additional review file function]

- **Step 6:** Record overall recommendation (accept/decline); and, submit the review

Six Steps—OCS Instructions View

REVIEW SCHEDULE

Director's Request	2012-04-15
Your Response	—
Review Submitted	—
Review Due	2012-05-13

REVIEW STEPS

1. Notify the submission's director, Hans Overbeek, as to whether you will undertake the review.

   Response   Will do the review 📧   Unable to do the review 📧

2. If you are going to do the review, consult Reviewer Guidelines below.

3. Review the submission.

   Submission Manuscript   77-294-1-RV.DOCX   2012-03-30
   Supplementary File(s)   None

4. Click on icon to enter (or paste) your review of this submission.

   Review 💬

5. In addition, you can upload files for the director and/or author to consult.

   Uploaded files   None

   [   ] Browse... Upload

6. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

   Recommendation   Choose One ▼   Submit Review To Director

REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Please take a balanced approach when reading these submissions. One of our objectives is to have a solid program that meets the needs of both metadata researchers and practitioners. As a result, it is important for you to be thorough. However, we also want a broad and interesting program--so please do not be overly judgmental.

You were selected to serve on the committee because you are an expert in your field. You probably received submissions which are not up to your personal standards. However, some of those submissions may still have merit for the DCMI community. Please try to keep an open mind. Don't worry about recommending too many submissions. If you think a submission will be interesting to conference attendees, then recommend it. Please be decisive in your reviews--either you think a submission is adequate or you think it is not. That will help the Program Committee to reach a reject/acceptance decision, which will in turn be more easily understood by the authors of the submission.

It is the responsibility of a reviewer to note any errors in content, to provide constructive criticism of ideas and interpretations, and to comment on the organization and clarity of the text. It is not the responsibility of a reviewer to correct the technical errors in writing but to note whether such errors exist to alert the author and the Program Committee of the need for further editing. A common approach that many reviewers take is to provide a brief overview of the content followed by a more detailed and systematic list of comments (negative and positive) and corrections. Such a list is even more important when your recommendation is to decline the submission or to accept with revisions. This information is essential for both: (1) the Program Committee to handle conflicting reviews; and (2) for the authors to understand the results of the review and to improve the submission.

Please note that submissions to DCMI conferences need **not** be limited to research and applications dealing with the Dublin Core set of properties but may address more general metadata issues of concern to the metadata community. Please use the following criteria in evaluating the submissions:

Full Papers:

- *Originality of the approach to implementation*
- *Generalizability of the methods and results described*
- *Quality of the contribution to the implementation community*
- *Significance of the results presented*
- *Clarity of presentation*

Project Reports:

- *Conciseness and completeness of technical description*
- *Usability of the technical description by other potential implementers*
- *Clarity of presentation*

Posters

- *Concise statement of research or project goals and milestones*
- *Significance of the research or project*
- *Framing of key barriers and future research*
- *Statement of results and accomplishments*

General peer reviewer guidelines are available at the bottom of the submission review page

REVIEW STEPS

1. Notify the submission's director, Hans Overbeek, as to whether you will undertake the review.

   Response   Will do the review 🖃   Unable to do the review 🖃

- Step #1 for **each** assigned submission is to notify the Chairs as to whether you "will do" or are "unable to do" the review

- Clicking the correct envelop icon brings up an editable email message to the Chairs

- After reading the email text (and editing, if useful), click "Send"

- *Important Note:* Until you complete Step #1, some links in the following steps are not active

SEND EMAIL

To	Schubert Foo <sfoo@pmail.ntu.edu.sg>
	Hans Overbeek <hoverbee@gmail.com>
CC	
BCC	

Add Recipient   Add CC   Add BCC

☐ Send a copy of this message to my address (sasutton@uw.edu)

Attachments	Browse... Upload
From	"Stuart A. Sutton" <sasutton@uw.edu>
Subject	[DC-2012] Able to Review
Body	Schubert Foo:

I am able and willing to review the submission, "Leveraging the DDI Model for Linked Statistical Data in the Social, Behavioural, and Economic Sciences," for International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications. I plan to have the review completed by its due date, 2012-05-13, if not before.

Stuart A. Sutton |

Send   Cancel   Skip Email

REVIEW SCHEDULE

Director's Request   2012-04-15
Your Response   —
Review Submitted   —
Review Due   2012-05-13

REVIEW STEPS

1. Notify the submission's director, Hans Overbeek, as to whether you will undertake the review.

   Response   Will do the review 🖅   Unable to do the review 🖅

2. If you are going to do the review, consult Review Guidelines below.

3. Review the submission.
   Submission Manuscript   77-294-1-RV.DOCX   2012-03-30
   Supplementary File(s)   None

4. Click on icon to enter (or paste) your review of this submission.

   Review 💬

5. In addition, you can upload files for the director and/or author to consult.
   Uploaded files   None
   [ ] Browse... Upload

6. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

   Recommendation   Choose One ▾   Submit Review To Director

The submission file is available here for download at any time during the review process

- When ready to enter your review, click the icon in Step #4 💬

- Enter your review in the text entry form
  - Top text entry box is for reviewer comments to be seen by the author <u>and</u> the chairs
  - Bottom text entry box is for confidential comments to be <u>seen by the chairs only</u>

- Review form text can be saved and opened again later for editing up to the point of submission of the review
  - Reviewers cannot change review text after submission in Step 6

6. Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Recommendation [Choose One ▾] [Submit Review To Director]

- After completing your review text, Step #6 asks you to select an overall "recommendation" for the submission:

  - **Accept Submission:** Select this option if you think that the submission can be published as it was submitted with no revisions or suggested refinements. *(Note: Few submissions meet this high standard. Most can benefit from some refinement based on reviewer advice.)*

  - **Accept Submission with Revisions:** Select this option if you think the submission is already acceptable but can be improved through suggested revisions.

  - **Decline Submission:** Decline a submission if in your opinion it does not meet requirements or is otherwise unsuitable. Decline a submission that holds promise or is potentially interesting but requires substantial revisions to be acceptable. DCMI peer review process does not include a second round of review for "conditional accepts".

- After selecting an overall recommendation, click the "Submit Review to Director" link to complete the review process.

DC-2012

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR SERVICE TO YOUR COLLEAGUES & TO DCMI