They are 10 Questions with no time limit. Please cross your idea.

1. swj1144   Linked Web APIs Dataset

Comment 1:
On Page 4:
"Similar approach … debatable question" -> Maybe in a footnote?

Question: Do you find where critic is appointing to?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   I am not sure ...

2. swj1257   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: Can you find the place the reviewer points?
Answer: I agree ...   I do not agree ...   I am not sure ...

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: Could you find were in the paper this comment is talking about?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   I am not sure ...

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?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   I am not sure ...

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 that this paragraph really claims a contribution?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   I am not sure ...

Comment 6:
4. RODI Benchmark Suite
> Multi-source integration can be tested as a sequence
> of different scenarios that share the same target ontol-
> ogy. 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 early? Did the author added some thing to back up this statement in the next paragraph?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   I am not sure ...

---

3. swj1367   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: Did you find in the paper where this comment is pointing to?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   To some extend ...   I am not sure ...

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 after this sentence above is also related to the question?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...   To some extend ... I am not sure ...

Comment 9:
> Table 11 shows those the scores for three conference
> domain scenarios
--> 'shows those scores'

Question: Did you easily find this comment in the article?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...

Comment 10:
Section 1.3
The newly
> added scenarios focus on features that are impor-
> tant to test mapping quality under real-world chal-
> lenges
- Sounds a bit odd to me. (Would have expected a passive like 'important to be tested under real-world challenges'.)

Question: Did you find this sentence easily in the paper?
Answer: Yes ...   No ...