

Scientific & Scholarly Editing Evaluation Form

Reviewer Information

First Name: REDACTED

Last Name: REDACTED

E-Mail: REDACTED

Date of Evaluation Submission: REDACTED

Synopsis of the Manuscript Evaluated:

Comments on the paper "REDACTED": The authors desire to measure information by reviewing they types of diverse information and the related models to describe the quality of information collected and measured is the focus in this theoretical paper. The quality of data is suggested to be related to what the intentional use of the data will be. The authors conclude that the ID dimension can be used to determine the re-use/ re-purposability of information.

Originality and Significance of the Contribution: *(Does the manuscript clearly explain its mission and coverage?)*

There is no abstract in this submission. There are no key words for search. See the other sections for more information.

Interest to the Research Community and/or Practitioners: *(How useful is the material to the field?)*

A very interesting paper, that can cause discussion. It will be interesting to see how the future work turns out. How data is used and for what purpose is of interest. As we go from a data-driven, knowledge-based economy, this information is of great value. Those that see to understand how crowdsourcing may impact their organization, would find value in the submission. Defining concepts is of value to know how other researchers can collaborate on similar problems using similar terminology is of value.

Coverage of Existing Literature: *(Does the literature review contain relevant information in support of the manuscript?)*

The literature appears to be timely enough and of good scope. Check the citations to be sure all are used in the submission.

Satisfactoriness of the Methodology, Analysis, and Comprehension: *(Does the manuscript contain a detailed explanation of research methods and procedures?)*

It would be helpful to define all terms operationally to assist the reader and it would further refine and make clear the scope and limitations of the results proposed. The section on Measuring Information Quality in CIEs seems to describe the problem that is being studied and would make a better introduction if it were revised a little to help the reader follow the terms being used. Consider that the reader may not be as familiar with the topic is being discussed but is still interested in the topic and the results of the study.

Clear, Concise, and Jargon-Free Writing: *(Does the manuscript clearly state the issues being addressed?)*

Please re-edit your submission to define all terms and explain the items in greater detail. The document needs rephrasing and there are areas where better word choice could help the reader to understand your points. For example, there is the need for grammatical editing throughout - commas, and punctuation are needed. Many word choices need to be revised to provide clarity for the reader. Abbreviations need to be fully defined. Avoid timestamps. There are numerous citation errors that need to be addressed. Please refer to the APA manual for directions on citations.

Organizational Structure: *(Is the manuscript clearly organized in a logical fashion? Are the author's conclusions supported by the research?)*

It would be nice to follow the 5 chapter model of research- it helps the reader to understand the presentation and set up of the document and how they might be able to apply this to their own organization. There is no real theory to the application lineage within this submission. It might be a consideration during the revision.

Major Weaknesses: *(List some of the major weaknesses of the manuscript)*

The introduction needs to be reworked. It does not describe the problem that is being studied. The discussion seems out of place. The structure and overall organization limits the content of the submission. The presentation as to why this presents a problem is not specifically outlined. The models are not well explained as to how they impact the theory within the document.

The paper is a theoretical paper with limits on why this is a problem/ what problem it will solve and what the solutions will entail. How is the application valuable to organizations? What can they learn from your submission? It is not clear from the presentation of the information. The use of italics is confusing- is this a citation or a result- how else could you let the reader know this is a result/conclusion. If it is not- do you need to cite this information?

Major Strengths: *(List some of the major strengths of the manuscript)*

The paper is generally well written with the exception of the introduction to the problem. It is not clear until later in the paper what the research problem is. This should come early so the reader knows what is being discussed and the background literature summarized. An interesting topic and suggests how knowledge can be used within organizations to facilitate change of process updating.

Recommendations: *(List of suggestions for the author to consider for improving the manuscript)*

Please review the 5 chapter model of all dissertations and submissions- there needs to be a structure of abstract, introduction, the methodology and results, conclusion and/or summary. There are pieces missing. The reader needs to follow a logical progression to understand your points made.

Definition of key terms being used would help. It is likely that every reader is not familiar with the specific definitions used in the paper for terms such as crowdsourcing, re-purposability, open information system, etc.

Page 3: Do you mean "users" in the discussion in the last paragraph. Isn't it the system designers that decide how the data will be collected? Controls are from the data collection engine that the users don't control. Page 3 is a good explanation of the focus of this paper. One of the examples would help early in the paper to set the context.

Other editorial comments

Page 1 last sentence in 2nd paragraph does not follow.

Page 2: Missing italics on the other 2 attributes of information deficiency.

Additional Comments to the Author:

Please revise this manuscript and I would be happy to re-review.

Ancillary Files? (Yes): *If yes, please send as an e-mail attachment with this evaluation form.*
Example: The manuscript with track changes and/or comment bubbles.

The manuscript has been initially edited in the beginning so the authors may review areas needing revision. There needs to be a thorough review of the submission to make sure the document conforms to the author guidelines.