

IDCC 2019 - your paper submission

IDCC 19 Programme Committee <idcc19@conftool.net>

Fri 2018-09-28 11:46

To: Lars Vilhuber <lars.vilhuber@cornell.edu>;

Cc: clagoze@umich.edu <clagoze@umich.edu>;

Dear Lars Vilhuber,

Thank you for your submission to IDCC19 in Melbourne. I am glad to be able to tell you that it has been accepted, possibly with qualifications which are detailed below. Please note any particular remarks from the programme committee which follow and take note of reviewers comments in preparing your final submission.

Thanks for your time in preparing your paper; we look forward to seeing you and hearing from you in Melbourne.

Kevin Ashley
on behalf of the IDCC Programme Committee.

CONTRIBUTION DETAILS

ID: 139

Title: A metadata package for journals to support external linked objects

REVIEW RESULT OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE:

This contribution has been accepted.

SPECIAL REMARKS:

You will see that your submission drew markedly different responses from our reviewers and this prompted extensive discussion of your submission amongst the programme committee. We have decided to accept the submission, but ask you to take particular note of the more critical comments in preparing your final paper, particularly those regarding the necessity of the work and the challenges of acceptance.

OVERVIEW OF REVIEWS

Review 1

=====

Evaluation of the Contribution

Quality (10%): 08 - Good work, significant
Significance (10%): 06 - Not bad
Originality (10%): 06 - One step forward
Relevance (10%): 08 - Definitely relevant
Presentation (10%): 08 - Well written
Overall recommendation (50%): 08 - Probably accept (good quality)

Comments for the Authors

The development of a consistent metadata package for journals to support linking to supplementary materials is a valuable contribution for consistency of metadata over disciplines and organisations, and addressing the challenges of linking publications to data. The submission is clear and well written.

I would like to have seen more about the rationale for the metadata elements chosen.

In the final paper I would like to see some discussion around the challenges of encouraging different organisations operating with different technologies to adopt common standards, and how the tools you have developed can facilitate metadata creation and adoption, as well as how they can be integrated in different organisations. Have you approached any of the potential users of the tools and schema directly to examine such issues?

There are not very many references included in the submission - is there more existing work that has influenced your choices or informed the background to the problem you are addressing?

Review 2

=====

Evaluation of the Contribution

Quality (10%): 06 - Solid work
Significance (10%): 04 - Low significance
Originality (10%): 04 - Better works on the same topic exist
Relevance (10%): 06 - Close enough
Presentation (10%): 08 - Well written

Overall recommendation (50%): 08 - Probably accept (good quality)

Comments for the Authors

The paper proposes linking publications and supplemental materials through a designated metadata field (and subfields). This is a simple but useful conceptual step in enhancing publication metadata. However, the details of the proposed schema as well as implementation discussion are rather limited. It is not clear why current journal efforts cannot document early deposits and restricted-access data. Are they lacking proper metadata fields? Sections on previous work are long, but quite vague. Why is there a need for a new schema rather than an enhancement of what already exists? How would that fit with the existing journal publishing efforts?

With the conference theme of collaborations and partnerships it would make sense to discuss how these various overlapping efforts could work together. Also, the burden of creating metadata is put again on individual researchers, which would probably undermine the whole effort. This needs to be addressed in the discussion of barriers.

Review 3

=====

Evaluation of the Contribution

Quality	(10%): 10 - Excellent work and a significant contribution
Significance	(10%): 10 - Very significant
Originality	(10%): 08 - A pioneer work
Relevance	(10%): 10 - Appropriate to the point
Presentation	(10%): 10 - Excellently written
Overall recommendation (50%):	10 - Definitely accept (very high quality)

Comments for the Authors

Excellent submission, and I have no hesitation in recommending it be accepted. My main comment would be about the use of the term "symmetrical", which requires a bit of unpacking. There are also a couple of smaller typos which a thorough proof-read will catch, e.g. "his reviewed" rather than "is reviewed". References for the initial claim ("greater scrutiny") are also absent, and I would describe DOI as the leading PID standard, as opposed to just "the standard".

--

14th International Digital Curation Conference

<https://www.conftool.net/idcc19/>

<http://www.dcc.ac.uk/events/idcc19>