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|  |
| --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** |
| *Title:* |  **Data repository for DARIAH** | *Document identifier:* | **D6.2** |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | **[please fill in]** |
| *Author(s):* |  | *Date:* | **[please fill in]** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** |
| *Reviewer:* | **Donatella Castelli** | *Activity:* | **[please fill in]** |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| Major issues are summarised below. i) The objectives of the activity  should be better specified. Same for the results achieved. By reading the text several interpretations are possible.ii) The work actually done should be clarified - it’s difficult to distinguish between the pre-existing system and what has been developed in EGI-ENGAGE.iii) Some terminology seems to be used differently along the document.iv) I understand that the exercise is done to serve the DH community, but it is unclear what are the specific requirement of this  community and the advantages brought by this solution. |
| **Response from Author:**  |
|  |

**Additional comments**

*(not affecting the document content e.g. recommendations for the future)*

|  |
| --- |
| **From reviewer:** |
|  |

**Detailed comments on the content**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author(correction / reject,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** |  |  | 1. In the document  often two different  concepts are mixed: a) he sw that can be instantiated to create a repository /search engine b) The repository service, managed by a specific responsible entity,  built by deploying the sw on certain servers and uploading specific collection This mix  starts from the abstract:“The activity developed and deployed two systems: a digital repository system based on gLibrary framework …….”Often, the term “system” is used to mean both the sw & the service. I have highlighted in yellow in the text some of such occurrences. It is unclear if the aim of the Task is to develop a sw or to offer a service. | **The aim was to develop a new software for the A&H community which can be used as a service.** |
| **2** |  |  | For this pilot application the DARIAH contents have been provided by the Austrian Academy of Sciences” - No description of this pilot application is given - Is the feedback expected be collected based on this application? DARIAH includes a very variegated pool of providers of heterogeneous content. How is are the collection provided by this single provider representative of this variegated context? | **Additional information about the AAS datasets have been included in the D6.2 (v5).** |
| **3** |  |  | "The first setup of the pilot provides to a lightweight and sophisticate tool for members of the DH community to organize and manage digital repositories on top of the EGI Federated Cloud.” -here I understand that the aim of the activity is to offer a tool to organise and manage already existing digital repositories  - at this point I am really confused.  In section 3 you say "In this deliverable we have presented a solution to manage digital repository in cloud-based infrastructure”. What the aim of the activity really is? | **The original aim of this pilot was to create a digital repository of DARIAH contents with the possibility to exploit the EGI FedCloud testbed.****As described in v5 during the work-plan these objectives shifted a little bit.** **- INFN customized the PSSE to take into account new requirements coming from the A&H community. For this service a first demonstrator is now available.****- INFN updated the architecture of the gLibrary to create digital repositories collecting datasets stored in different database back-ends and offer the possibility to interact with the EGI FedCloud object storage. For this service we are waiting for some contribution from AAS.**  |
| **4** |  |  | It unclear what has been developed in the context of the EGI-ENGAGE project and what in different ones.  In Section 1 you say:“services have been further extended and improved"    while later you say:"The remaining of this document presents the architecture of the two frameworks that have been setup and tailored for the DH community - you do not specify what has been done to tailor what you had for the DH community "  | **In the contest of this project INFN has:*** **Customized the Parallel Semantic Search Engine to run SPARQL queries on additional digital repositories provided by AAS.**
* **Improved the architecture of gLibrary to create digital repositories stored in different DB back-ends.**
 |
| **5** |  |  | The relation between gLibrary, gLibrary1 and gLibrary2. The name of the tool is “gLibrary” but then the documentation refers to the other two. | **gLibrary was the first release of the service (before DARIAH).****gLibrary2 has been developed during the DARIAH CC. There is no gLibrary1** |
| **6** |  |  | I would have expected that requirements had something to so with the DH community. Actually, the document refers to this community at the beginning, but then nothing is said on the peculiar requirements of this community  in the rest of the document. | **The requirements have been included in the new version of D6.2** |
| **7** |  |  | The User & the Technical documentation is the same. I would have expected to find two different ones.  | **We have removed the User documentation.** |
| **8** |  |  | For a deliverable like this one I was expecting that requirements and validation play a very relevant role. Instead the corresponding sections are either very limited  or empty! Have you set up any evaluation environment? If so, the work done for this activity should be reported as well. | **Requirements were set at preparation stage of the Competence Centre proposal and they were quite general. Detailed evaluation of the services is in progress although preliminary feedbacks are positive.** |
| **9** |  |  | Notice that by “publication/data repository” in literature and in common practice it is meant an “on-line service” (e.g. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institutional_repository>, <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/>). The definition given in the deliverable looks different from this one. Notice that the repository service usually offers also facilities for content submission. | **gLibrary-based repositories are online although they can be private and not-open. The level of privacy depends on the use cases and it is up to the community to decide it.** |
| **10** |  |  | Concerning the links to the tool, please, check the link to gLibrary (i.e. Current link: [https://glibrary.ct.infn.it](https://glibrary.ct.infn.it/), Testing endpoint: [https://glibrary.ct.infn.it:3500](https://glibrary.ct.infn.it:3500/)). I do not understand what is the difference between “current link” and “testing endpoint”.  | **The testing endpoint is now working.** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**

Note: English and typo corrections can be made directly in the document as comments.

# User Story: XXX

## Description

## Structured review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Is the tool satisfying the use case?** |  |
| **Are all the sections and links properly working?** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Learnability (how easy is it for users to accomplish basic tasks of the use case?)** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Ease in finding the information in the tool** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Ease to keep track of the location in the site** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Is the help section explaining well how to use the tool?** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Ease to make mistakes when performing an action** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Is the interface familiar/intuitive for the users?** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **Unexpected or confusing behaviour of the tool, including bugs** | *<Please report your findings here>* |