

## QC Review of D2.3.8v2

Mostly minor English points, have integrated them into the source file.

Other points:

1. Please add USFD to Work Package Participants list.
2. Don't forget to update the Changes table....
3. Some edits needed to Exec Summary
4. page 2 Introduction – what do you mean by “significant representatives of the SW community”?
5. page 2, section 1.1 “the dynamics of ontologies in use is quite high” – doesn't really make sense. Do you mean that the ontologies are rapidly changing?
6. page 5 section 1.4 “Tasks T2.3.1. and T2.3.3.3” check these task numbers
7. page 7 section 2.1. What exactly do you mean by “an instance in time” here? Do you mean a snapshot at a particular moment?
8. page 7, section 2.1. Is there any link between the manual creation of the ontology and the ontology learning? They are shown in the figure as completely separate, but could they potentially be combined? i.e. would you consider using ontology learning initially and then having the ontology engineers post-process the created ontology and correct or improve it? That's fairly standard procedure as generally automatic ontology learning isn't accurate enough on its own. If so then this should be shown in the diagram and explained in the text.
9. page 8, section 2.2. It's quite confusing the way you explain the acronym DINO with 3 different interpretations. I think it would be much better to present a single interpretation and stick to it. Also to give a concise explanation of what DINO actually is, at the start of this section (it is not really clear at the moment). This point is open for discussion, but you'd have to first convince me that I'm wrong 😊
10. Chapter 2. This chapter is only 2 pages long and seems a bit pointless as a separate chapter, especially as both chapters are about DINO and I don't see the need for a separate chapter which basically just introduces DINO (as Chapter 2 currently does). I think it would be much better to integrate this whole chapter with chapter 3, and modify the introduction of Chapter 3 appropriately.
11. Table 3.1. Is there a word missing in the NL suggestion scheme box for the first axiom pattern?
12. Chapters 4 and 5. I think it might make more sense to switch the order of Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 5 gives an example of an experiment with DINO in a real situation; Chapter 4 gives some examples of other situations where it could be used (but as far as I can tell, these have not been implemented). Either way, perhaps a better title for Chapter 4 would be something like "Other Possible Application Domains". Currently it sounds as if the chapter presents cases where DINO has been used, rather than suggestions for possible uses. Also are there any plans to implement DINO in any of these cases suggested?
13. Chapter 4, 1st paragraph. Is there a relationship with this work and RIDE? This is (as far as I remember) the first time you've mentioned RIDE, and yet it seems to have quite a

strong link. If so, you should explain this and emphasise it (it's generally considered a good thing to have synergy between EU projects).

14. Section 5.1. Can you give a brief explanation/description of CO-ODE?

I don't think it is explained anywhere.

15. Section 5.1. The OAEI - wasn't this done as part of KWeb? If so, it's worth mentioning....

16. Figure 5.1 - can you enlarge this slightly?

17. Reference to Table 5.1 is wrong (and some subsequent table references). Also can you put table titles underneath rather than above the table (to follow standard practice in deliverables).

18. Figures 5.2 - 5.5 - these are a bit too small and slightly fuzzy - can you do something to improve this?

19. Section 5.2, bottom of page 28. I don't understand how relevance can be less than zero. Surely something cannot have less than no relevance? Also mentioned in Section 5.3.

20. Section 6.2.1. Can you make it clear if you're talking about installing on Windows or on all platforms, at the beginning of this section? Also mention whether it works on other platforms and if there are any problems or differences with these platforms.

21. Section 6.2.1, page 33. Perhaps highlight in the example which are the parts that need to be modified by the user. Also the example shows `tagger.dir=f:/treetagger/bin` (and `spanish_wn.dir`). Shouldn't this be shown as a relative rather than absolute path (since the exact location will differ for users)?

22. References. Fix the capitalisation of [Eic06] entry.

23. A.3. I don't understand the footnote here (more information available in the full report, since you refer to this exact deliverabl).

24. A4. Where's the extended version of this report that you mention??

25. Appendix B. Can you explain at the beginning of this appendix how this work fits into the deliverable? Also we've been talking about medical domains throughout and now we talk about astronomy, which seems a bit odd.

26. B.2 Resources. Can you please explain the patterns used in a bit more detail? It is not clear what this pattern represents and how it is used.

A couple of general points - I spent an inordinate amount of time adding determiners to your nouns! It would be a serious improvement to your English if you were to study this phenomenon a little (many non-native English speakers also make this same mistake).