Article: Dealing with post-excavation data: the Omeka S TiMMA web-database

Authors: Rueff, Bastien

Peer Review by: Electra Tsaknaki

Date: 17/07/2023

Article Summary:

This article provides a comprehensive review of the TiMMA project's web database and all its functionalities and tools in order to deal with data (and metadata) created from post- excavations and CH sites, while promoting the user-friendliness of the web interface. The project's ultimate goal is to explore the timber in Minoan and Mycenaean architecture, which led to the need to introduce a way of presenting and dealing with data through a web interface.

Strengths:

- The author presents a compelling argument about the exploitation of the Omeka S web publishing platform and its functionalities.
- The tools that were incorporated into the web database are thoroughly presented and analyzed through the different sub-sections of the paper.
- It is clear that the final users are always at the center of the development process, something that all developers should take into account.
- The vocabulary and syntax of the article are suitable for a scientific publication.
- There aren't any sentences that state an opinion without having a reference to support the statement.
- The sub-sections detailing the technologies employed in the project, specifically those in "*The perspective of the supervisor: data management and opening / linking data"*, and those in "*The perspective of the user: accessibility, security, use and publication*" demonstrate thorough research and clarity in presentation. These segments effectively convey all the necessary information for readers to comprehend the arguments and discussions put forth in the article.
- You provide constructive criticism of all the functionalities of Omeka S, and you always explain how you adopted them in an effective way for the project needs.
- The "*Conclusion"* part provides the next steps to the research of the field through a general discussion of the limitations you faced.

Weaknesses:

In the "*Introduction"* section, I have a few minor concerns. Here are some pieces of information that I think were missing:

- It is not clear to the reader what the rationale is and why did you propose this particular project in the first place (before funding),
- Why did you choose the Minoan and Mycenaean architectures?
- How did all this lead to the development of the web database?
- Why didn't you exploit any other already existing tool that does the same thing (e.g., the Heurist, or AIR as you mentioned) and upload your data into this tool?
- Why didn't you create a smaller-scale web publishing tool or even an app for the needs of the project? (I know many projects that did this.) Wasn't this a main aspect of the project? Why not?

Some of the answers to these questions are partially given and assumed in the paper (like the sentences comparing Omeka S with Heurist and AIR – lines 79, 156), but they are not clearly stated and thoroughly explained. For example, in lines 62–63, there is a small explanation of the need for a web database, but I find it crucial to elaborate on this and focus on any existing projects that have done the same thing for their own needs. I know that this is not the main point of this paper, but if someone reads only this article (and not any other introductory papers of the TiMMA project), he should have a clear view of all those things. At last, I would like to see how you differentiate yourselves from any existing projects and shift the focus to the innovation you bring to the field.

- I would suggest having a "*Related Work"* section after the "*Introduction"* to gather the answers to these questions and to highlight the synergies (if any) or similarities with other projects.
- The references could be enhanced with some papers from journals with a high impact factor.
- In line 82 it is stated "as demonstrated in other projects". I would expect this sentence to have a few references and further explanation.
- Overall, I would like to see the innovation and the outcome of this fascinating project of yours, as well as the added value to the field, rather than the incorporation and presentation of an existing tool.

Smaller or specific remarks:

- Line 43 "Data was collected". I would like to see in just one word or two what kind of data you are referring to before proceeding to the next section.
- Line 122 "(what??)". I assume this is a comment you made to yourself when writing the paper (happens to all of us).

All in all, this is a great project, and I believe the paper will be a valuable contribution to the CAA proceedings. There are only a few minor adjustments that will help the reader clarify certain questions regarding the very nature of the project and the choices you made for its development.