Fwd: Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science - Decision on Manuscript ID EPB-2022-0116

Fernando A López Hernández <f8l5h9@gmail.com>   Thu, Jul 7, 2022 at 5:40 PM
To: David Rey Blanco <drey@idealista.com>, Pelayo Gonzalez Arbues <pgarbues@idealista.com>, Antonio Paez <paezha@gmail.com>

Señores, el trabajo se nos acumula.
Abajo la decisión de otro paper que sometimos en EPB.
Hay que dedicarle un poco de trabajo pero nada insalvable

Hablamos

Fernando

Inicio del mensaje reenviado:

De: Shalini Lakhera <onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com>
Asunto: Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science - Decision on Manuscript ID EPB-2022-0116
Fecha: 7 de julio de 2022, 9:59:31 CEST
Para: fernando.lopez@upct.es
Reenviado por: <fernando.lopez@upct.es>
Responder a: epb@sagepub.co.uk

07-Jul-2022

Dear Dr. Lopez

Manuscript ID EPB-2022-0116 entitled "A geo-referenced micro-data set of real estate listings for Spain's three largest cities" which you submitted to the Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science, has been reviewed. The comments of the referee(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

I have received three reports, although I'm only including below one since the other two provided feedback to me directly and were very favorable of your paper. The third one is equally supportive of your submission but, as you will see, also raises important aspects and provides useful feedback that will in my view make the paper better. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the referee(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Your revised manuscript will be returned to the referees for further review. Please note that referees sometimes harden their stance when reviewing the second time around.

To revise your manuscript, log into https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/epb and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc04.manuscriptcentral.com/epb?URL_MASK=c1171ad875dd4161b94528fb3880c441

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also

highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Also, please upload a separate document by including your response (detailed) to the reviewers comments. Please note the requirements for figures in the author guidelines at http://www.envplan.com/bauthors.html and upload the correct files.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the referee(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the referee(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science, your revised manuscript should be submitted by 05-Oct-2022. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision by this date, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely

Prof. Dani Arribas-Bel
Editor, Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science
epb@sagepub.co.uk

Referee(s)' Comments to Author:

Referee: 1

Comments to the Author
Dear Authors,
Thank you for the opportunity to review your paper. This manuscript is about the publishing of a one-year relocated and randomised listing price data set for three cities in Spain. Both the asking price and coordinates information are anonymised which limits the usefulness of the data for teaching and academic research. Given the house price data is partly from the Idealista company, it is not clear under which kind of licence the data is being issued and to what extent it may be considered open. The unknown quality of this one year randomised data is the main issue for potential users. Having read the paper many times, I believe that the authors have created the idealista18 package (https://github.com/paezha/idealista18). The Idealista18 Github readme file is too simple to guidance users on how to access the data with the R package. So I am not sure it is the right one. The authors are to be commended for their intention to make open real estate data available in an R package which should render it easily accessible for teaching and research. Below is a list of comments and questions that I had which may need to be addressed in future editions of this work.
1.   Please reference the package and dataset and include in the text and in the package the license under which the data is released. The Idealista18 github site is unclear on how to access the data with the package.

2.   Please state your anticipated research impacts from the publication of this data set in the introduction. It would be useful to state how this one-year relocated, and randomised house price data might be best used by academics in research and teaching. The relocated and randomised data may be difficult to further enrich with other variables, the authors need to show how the 44 variables is enough for future users.
3.   The method of randomisation is described but it would be advantageous to publish the code for this so that researchers can evaluate the impact of this kind of randomisation on this and other data sets. Does the method, as seems likely, have a differential effect on data from high density areas as compared with low? To what extent are analyses likely to be confined to neighbourhood levels of resolution given the method of spatial randomisation? It would be useful to have some idea of the size of the neighbourhoods to facilitate comparison with other spatial data sets

4.   More details on the data collection methods of Idealista would be useful in interpreting the data. Does

Idealista concentrate on particular market segments or not? Are the list prices good indicators of actual sale prices? Are there sources from which actual paid prices could be identified?

5.   It would be useful for the authors to evaluate the datasets in the light of the FAIR guiding principles for research data stewardship (findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability).

6.   Given the asking price has resized the original asking price with a random percentage between -2.5% and +2.5%, please elaborate on how this influences quantitative research results and findings with this data.

7.   Please kindly add in a usage notes section how this data can be useful for the EPB audience. For example, introduce how this anonymised house price data can be integrated with other data and research. The original data could be a nice data set for a series of housing related papers. If the authors are unable to publish this original asking price, it maybe worthwhile to publish the research based on this data rather than using the randomised data. House price is locationally sensitive, but both the location and price data in this manuscript are altered by anonymisation. The authors need to show for which analyses the data remains valid despite anonymisation.

Referee: 2

Comments to the Author
(There are no comments.)