

OVERALL EVALUATION

Rankings: [1 = unacceptable; 10 = excellent]

(do not mark those that do not apply)

{to enter your rankings in tables use the lock button from the Toolbar of Forms in MS-Word and save at the end)

Recommendations for review

My overall recommendation is:

Outstanding	<input type="checkbox"/>
Definitely accept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minor revisions required before accept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major revisions required before accept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Definitely reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Editorial Decision

Accept	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accept after specified revision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation Criteria

Popularity of the subject	7
Appropriateness for journal	2
Adequacy of literature review	6
Quality of research design	4
Adequacy of data analysis	5
Contributions to the literature	3
Legitimacy of conclusions	6
Practical/Managerial significance	5
Clarity of presentation	2

GENERAL POINTS

A. Briefly summarize the paper in your own words, making sure to identify the paper's contribution to the field of SW and IS.

The paper describes a formal framework to semanticize the Web of today. The proposed framework mainly includes a Web store created by the web crawler and semantic store created by extractors and annotators. Also the paper briefly discusses the proposal of agent for semantic search.

*B How **SIGNIFICANT** is this paper?*

(How important is the problem studied? Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? Please consider relevance to both CS and IS communities.)

☐ Very significant ☒ Moderately significant ☐ Not significant

Please explain your rating?

*C. How **ORIGINAL** is this paper?*

(Are the problems and approaches new? Is this a novel combination of existing techniques? Does the paper point out differences from related research? Does it address a new problem or one that has not been studies in depth? Does it introduce an interesting research paradigm? Does it introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?)

☐ Very original ☒ moderately original ☐ Not original

Please explain your rating?

*D. Please comment on the **QUALITY** of this paper?*

(Is the paper technically sound? Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? Are its claims backed up? Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well-known technique? Does the paper back up a theoretical idea already in the literature with experimental evidence? Does it offer a theoretical analysis of prior experimental results?)

E. Please comment on the **CLARITY** of this paper?

(Is the paper well written? Does it motivate the research? Are the % results described and evaluated? Is the paper organized in a logical fashion? Is the paper written in a manner that makes it accessible to most educators and/or educational system developers? Is the paper written in clear English? Is the readability good, average or poor? Are there any presentation problems?)

Basically the paper is organized clearly, but is not well written. It is not easy to read and understand the paper.

F. Please comment on the appropriateness of the title, abstract and conclusion?

The abstract and conclusion, which are almost same, are not illustrated clearly. Also the title does not cover the whole content of the paper.

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR:

i) Weak Points of the Paper:

First, the paper seems to be out of the scope of the special issue. It is said in the paper that in many places of the work, both in the modeling part and in implementation soft computing techniques are used. But there is no any explicit discussion in the paper how soft computing techniques are applied. Second, the paper mainly describes a formal framework to semanticize the Web of today and some strategies are given. But the paper suffers from the lack of technical details in the modeling and implementation.

Finally, the paper is not well written. The readability is poor. It is unclear that what is the difference between Web store and Web repository and what is the difference between semantic store and semantic repository. What does “chapter” mean in the paper? The paper needs to be improved by English native speaker.

ii) Strong Points of the paper:

Reviewer: Please feel free to include relevant publications and literature the authors should study or cite as appropriate in sections iii and iv. Feel free to include URLs from citeseer, ACM or IEEE digital libraries.

iii) Recommended minor revisions? (if any)

N/A

iv) Recommended major Revisions? (if any)

(In case of major revisions, the revised paper will be reviewed again and authors will be asked to provide a short summary of the performed revisions along with the revised paper.)

N/A

How confident are you in your appropriateness as a referee for this paper?

- ☐ Very confident - I am an expert in this area.
☒ Confident - I have a reasonable knowledge of this area.
☐ Fairly confident - I have some knowledge of this area.
☐ Not confident - I have no significant knowledge of this area.

COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR:

This portion of the rating form is for journal editors only. Please give your reasons for your evaluations and specific criticisms.