

Observations made during the data assessment according to the set of questions table

FAIR	Set of questions / Data categories form	Observations made during the data assessment and decisions made to standardise dataset
General	6. Type of study	6. Some articles could be defined as multiple types of studies (such as a paper that was mainly describing a modern reference collection but then went on to apply the results of modern plant analysis to archaeological remains. In this case it was) We decided that the main objective of the study should be used to select the type of study category.
Is data accessible?	9. What is the journal type?	9. We had to add the option of 'closed' to the journal type category as some journals had no option for open access publishing and therefore did not come under either open or hybrid.
How interoperable and reusable is the data?	12. Processing method communication 13. Is the counting method replicable? 14. Instruments used described	12. The processing method communication category needed to be adjusted during the assessment. Some articles did not provide any description of processing methods to extract phytoliths. A 'no method reported' answer was consequently added to the drop down list . 13. The phytolith articles assessed in this study concern archaeobotany but also plant physiology, chemical-mineral analysis and bioremediation treatment of soil, among other possibilities. Some of these papers were proving difficult to assess due to differences in methodology and particularly methods of analysing phytoliths, therefore we needed to adapt our data collection strategy to preserve the FAIR assessment's representability of all areas of phytolith research. Therefore, we added a 'Not applicable' answer to the counting method category when

		the aim of the study was not to count phytolith morphotypes nor to identify the phytolith to the taxonomic level.
	<p>Data quality (17-25) : 17. Data location</p> <p>19. Data type</p> <p>How to assess papers where data is obtained from two different sources?</p> <p>20. Data format</p>	<p>Data quality (17-25) :</p> <p>19. Another issue that needed moderation was how to assess articles that provided only processed data. For example, some articles only provided one or few sample results in table format instead of reporting the full raw data for each sample. For this category, the answers i) to v) (raw counts, raw counts and weights, presence/absence, relative presence/percentages and mean and range) were clearly redefined for single morphotype counting only. If the counting of morphotypes was grouped in any way, we decided to identify it as "summary data - plant grouping".</p> <p>20. The assessment is looking for the best type of data to reuse. An article that provides graphic information with percentages makes it difficult to reuse the information, as percentages are not proper data. If within the same article there is a table with just plant groupings, the assessors will record the table. Any table means you put 'table' in the text of the article</p>