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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Details of the document being reviewed** | | | |
| *Title:* | EGI-Engage D 6.2 Data repository for DARIAH | *Document identifier:* | 2492-v1 |
| *Project:* | **EGI-Engage** | *Document url:* | https://documents.egi.eu/public/ShowDocument?docid=2492 |
| *Author(s):* | **[please fill in]** | *Date:* | 03 February 2016 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identification of the reviewer** | | | |
| *Reviewer:* | Donatella Castelli | *Activity:* |  |

**General comments on the content**

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments from Reviewer:** |
| Semantic search offers interesting information to researchers in general and to the culture heritage community in particular. In order to improve the current version of the search engine I suggest to focus in particular on:   1. Improve the response time that too long if compared with more traditional search engines users are used to; 2. Do some preliminary steps to increase the quality of the metadata harvested. The low quality of metadata is very well known problem when creating search engines from existing external data sources. The point is that the quality of the service as perceived by the user strongly depends also on the quality information retrieved. This quality of the metadata also can also negatively affect the underlying generation of semantic links. |
| **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,  …)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**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?** | *<Please report your findings here>* |
| **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>* |