# **Expert Evaluation Instructions**

This questionnaire is intended to collect expert feedback on the quality and relevance of AI-generated summaries produced by the ***VisitorLensAI*** tool, within the context of cultural heritage site analysis and management.

The questionnaire is divided into several sections. **Each section corresponds to a specific category, i.e., a criterion**, based on the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.

At the beginning of each section, the **name of the criterion is provided, along with several example keywords** that are commonly associated with that criterion.

As an expert, you are then asked to **enter one or more keywords** into the ***VisitorLensAI***user interface that, in your professional opinion, best capture the essence of the given criterion. These keywords do not have to match the examples provided – they may include any terms you believe are relevant to the category under evaluation. Based on your input, the system will generate a **summarized comment representation derived from actual user reviews**.

You are then invited to **carefully read each keyword and its corresponding summary**, and evaluate it by answering **three questions** that assess:

* ***Factual Correctness*** – To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion?
* ***Helpfulness*** – Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site?
* ***Coherence*** – Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities?

This process is repeated for each criterion: for every section of the questionnaire, you are expected to enter new keywords (of your own choosing) and respond to the same three evaluation questions, based on the newly generated summaries.

Your feedback will help validate the accuracy, relevance, and overall usefulness of the ***VisitorLensAI*** framework in practical heritage site management scenarios.

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Authenticity and Integrity | |
| --- | --- |
| 1.1 Material authenticity | Original walls; patina; reconstructed elements; stone carving quality; authentic materials. |

| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Authenticity and Integrity | |
| --- | --- |
| 1.2 Spiritual/authentic atmosphere | Spiritual atmosphere; tranquility/peace; religious continuity; emotional experience. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Authenticity and Integrity | |
| --- | --- |
| 1.3 Continuity of tradition | Living tradition; local ceremonies; cultural memory; folk customs. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Historical and artistic value | |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 Architectural characteristics | fortification; proportions; Gothic style; Romanesque style; engineering ingenuity. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Functionality and interpretation | |
| --- | --- |
| 3.1 Educational content | info panels; live guides; AR application; museum exhibition. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Functionality and interpretation | |
| --- | --- |
| 3.2 Accessibility (PwD) | ramps; tactile paths; audio guide; wheelchair access. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Functionality and interpretation | |
| --- | --- |
| 3.3 Digital guides and signage | QR codes; interactive displays; multimedia guide; app. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Visitor experience and infrastructure | |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 Aesthetics and photogenic appeal | panoramic view; golden hour; Instagrammable; picturesque surroundings. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Visitor experience and infrastructure | |
| --- | --- |
| 4.2 Crowds and atmosphere | crowds; peaceful; tourist noise; entrance queues. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Visitor experience and infrastructure | |
| --- | --- |
| 4.3 Services and amenities | souvenir shop; restrooms; parking; café; signposts. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| 1. Visitor experience and infrastructure | |
| --- | --- |
| 4.4 Safety and cleanliness | cleanliness; vandalism; lighting; slippery surfaces. |

| Factual Correctness *This aspect of evaluation assesses the extent to which the summarized comment representation, generated for a specific keyword and UNESCO criterion, accurately reflects the actual conditions and characteristics of the heritage site (e.g., infrastructure, authenticity, ambiance). The emphasis is on factual alignment – whether the summary content corresponds to the expert’s knowledge of the site, rather than mirroring specific visitor statements.* | |
| --- | --- |
| To what extent does the summarized review accurately reflect the real characteristics of the site associated with the given keyword and UNESCO criterion? | **5 – Fully accurate**  *The summary is entirely consistent with the actual conditions and characteristics of the site. It reflects a precise and factually correct interpretation of the keyword in relation to the UNESCO criterion.* |
| **4 – Mostly accurate**  *The summary is generally accurate and reflects the key characteristics of the site, with only minor factual omissions or imprecisions.* |
| **3 – Partially accurate**  *The summary includes some relevant elements but omits or distorts important factual aspects. It gives a partial or simplified picture of the actual site features.* |
| **2 – Minimally accurate**  *The summary contains significant factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations. It does not reliably reflect the site’s actual characteristics related to the keyword.* |
| **1 – Not accurate**  *The summary is factually incorrect or misleading in relation to the site. It does not correspond to the actual situation known to the expert.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |
| Helpfulness *This evaluation criterion assesses how useful the summarized comment representation is for understanding visitor perspectives and supporting informed decision-making in the context of cultural heritage management. The focus is on practical value—whether the summary can guide institutional actions or help interpret public sentiment in a meaningful way.* | |
| Based on your professional expertise in the field, to what extent do you find the summarized comment representation helpful for understanding visitor perspectives and informing decisions related to this aspect of the site? | **5 – Very helpful**  *The summary offers clear, relevant, and actionable insights. It provides valuable guidance for institutions to understand visitor attitudes and improve site management or interpretation.* |
| **4 – Mostly helpful**  *The summary is generally informative and relevant, though it may lack some specificity or contextual nuance. Still useful for institutional decision-making.* |
| **3 – Moderately helpful**  *The summary provides some useful information but is limited in depth or clarity. Only partially supports understanding of visitor perspectives.* |
| **2 – Slightly helpful**  *The summary is vague or general. It gives minimal insight and has limited value for informed decision-making or understanding public opinion.* |
| **1 – Not helpful**  *The summary is irrelevant, unclear, or too generic to be of use. It fails to inform or support institutional understanding.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |

| Coherence *This aspect of evaluation assesses the internal consistency and clarity of the summarized comment representation. A coherent summary should be logically structured, thematically consistent, and free from contradictions or abrupt shifts in focus. The emphasis is on whether the summary reads as a unified and meaningful statement.* | |
| --- | --- |
| Based on your professional judgment, does the summarized comment representation appear coherent and logically consistent, without contradictions or thematic discontinuities? | **5 – Fully coherent**  *The summary is logically structured, clearly presented, and thematically unified throughout.* |
| **4 – Mostly coherent**  *The summary is well-structured and consistent, with only minor issues in clarity or focus.* |
| **3 – Moderately coherent**  The summary is understandable but contains minor inconsistencies or weak thematic connections. |
| **2 – Minimally coherent**  *There is some attempt at structure, but the content lacks logical flow or clarity.* |
| **1 – Not coherent at all**  *The summary is confusing, disjointed, and contains contradictions or abrupt thematic shifts.* |
| **0 – Cannot be evaluated**  *Cannot be evaluated due to lack of review content.* |