

Do you think this critic is valid?
Do you agree with the reviewer?

1. swj1144.pdf Linked Web APIs Dataset

Comment 1:

On Page 4:

“Similar approach ... debatable question” -> Maybe in a footnote?

Question: Do you think this critic is valid?

2. swj1257.pdf RODI: Benchmarking Relational-to-Ontology Mapping Generation Quality

Comment 2:

in Section 2.1 "Naming Conflicts" I believe that some of the challenges you claim to be unique to the relational-to-ontology context (singular vs. plural names, different tokenization) do actually also exist in other contexts such as ontology alignment.

Question: How much do you agree with the reviewer?

Comment 3:

* Table 1: It is not clear to me how something as unspecific as an instance of owl:Class can provide `_guidance_` to a mapping creator.

Question: Do you know what this comment is talking about?

Comment 4:

* 4.1 "Overview":

* Table 2 The first 3 columns reproduce table 1, which wastes space. Think of a better way of arranging this information.

Question: Was the reviewer correct?

Comment 5:

1.3. Contributions

> - The RODI framework: the RODI software pack

I would not count this as a contribution of a scientific paper.

Question: Do you think the this paragraph really claims a contribution?

Comment 6:

4. RODI Benchmark Suite

- > Multi-source integration can be tested as a sequence
- > of different scenarios that share the same target ontology. We include specialized scenarios for such testing
- > with the conference domain.

I don't really agree that this would cover all issues of multi-source integration. Things like multiple resources referring to the same real-world individuals, or violations of disjoint class axioms could be introduced without being noticed that way.

Question: Was this comment given too early? maybe the author have some thing to back up this statement in the next paragraph.

3. swj1367.pdf RODI: Benchmarking Relational-to-Ontology Mapping Generation Quality

Comment 7:

Section 1.1

- is vital (e.g., [17]), In order to help ontology-based
- > data integration finding its way into mainstream
- > 'is vital (e.g., [17]). In order to help ontology-based'

Question: Do you know what this comment is about?

Comment 8:

Section 4.3

"Geodata domain has been designed as a medium-sized case" → What does it mean medium size?

Question: Does the next sentence in the paper answer the question posed in this comment?

Comment 9:

- > Table 11 shows those the scores for three conference
- > domain scenarios
- > 'shows those scores'

Question: What is this comment about?

Comment 10:

Section 1.3

The newly

- > added scenarios focus on features that are important to test mapping quality under real-world challenges
- Sounds a bit odd to me. (Would have expected a passive like 'important to be tested under real-world challenges'.)

Question: Is this comment valid? Maybe the author backs up this statement before or after in the paragraph.