

## CHECKLIST FOR THE REVIEWER

### A few guidelines

- To provide the author(s) with the means to improve their paper, please comment objectively. On a separate sheet you may provide comments for the Editor that you may feel are necessary.
- Please document statements adequately.
- If a paper repeats previously published work please point this out to the Editor.
- Please explain the reasons for your answers on separate sheets, keying your comments to the letters A–M. You may of course also provide any further comment, keying your remarks to numbers in the manuscript.
- Some of the questions that follow should be answered on a scale of 1 to 3, where 1 is the highest rank and 3 the lowest. (Please circle / underline your answers).

Manuscript: **JAG**  
 Title: **ASSESS THE QUALITY OF DATA WITH A DECISION MODEL**  
 Author(s): A U Frank

Do you agree to your identity being revealed to the author(s)	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No
A Is this topic		
1 suitable for the journal?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No
2 of broad international interest?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No
3 significant?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No
4 novel?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No

*Please explain your answers to items 1–4 here briefly*

This is a well written paper (largely) which addresses important questions. The basic question has been of concern in the GI community for many years and this is a new approach, It does however rely on being able to reduce the decision to a single number which can be tested. Most geographical decisions are spatially extensive and may not be so tractable with the approach, but I like the approach and it should certainly be published.

B Clarity of objectives:	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> 1	2	3
C Quality of methods / correctness of mathematics:	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> 1	2	3
D Quality of data:	1	2	3
E Validity of assumptions and analyses:	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> 1	2	3
F Extent to which the interpretations / conclusions are supported by the data:	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> 1	2	3
G Overall significance of this work:	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> 1	2	3
H Is this paper			
1 properly organised?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No	
2 to the point / concise?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No	
3 written clearly using correct grammar and syntax?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	largely	No
I Are the approach, results and conclusions intelligible from the abstract alone?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No	
J Is the title informative and a reflection of the content?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No	
K Are the illustrations / tables			
1 useful and all necessary?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No	
2 of good quality?	<input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;" type="checkbox"/> Yes	No	

L	Is the referencing relevant, up to date and accessible?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		No
M	Are the keywords (if provided) appropriate and complete?	Yes		No
N	Overall quality of the work:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	2	3

---

Manuscript: JAG  
Title: ASSESS THE QUALITY OF DATA WITH A DECISION MODEL  
Author(s): A U Frank

---

O Can you suggest any improvements to this work, or any parts which could be shortened or removed?

In the title the English is not appropriate. Perhaps it should be “Assessing” instead of “Assess”

I wonder why the running header: “The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences” is used. Does this imply an assumption of outlet, a template used by the conference organisers (which no one else has used) or prior publication of this piece?

Page 1: The statement: “Data is used to improve decisions; this is the only use of data” is not quite correct, as I think the author will acknowledge. Data is used in an attempt to improve decisions. Decisions will not necessarily improve just because data is used – what if the data is completely irrelevant – then the decision may remain unchanged – and does a decision have to be changed to be improved – No. I think that the statement should be something like: “*Appropriate* data is used to improve *confidence* in decisions; this is the only appropriate use of data”

In the light of this comment there may be some changes to be made in subsequent paragraphs.

In paragraph 1 of column 2 on page 1 some text is in German. Is this deliberate?

Final paragraph, Page 1. I cannot agree with the statement “data quality, which is the absence of imperfections.” I like the idea of talking about imperfections, so no problem there, it is just that *data quality* does not imply a complete lack of imperfections – although *Quality data* probably does imply the minimum of imperfections, it is still not a lack of imperfections. Data quality is the description of the imperfections. I think this is partly a question of English word order.

Page 2. The discussion referring to bridge construction talks of “the maximally possible flow  $R$ ” but bridge construction is to a tolerance of some return period flood – not the maximally possible. The 250 year flood or the 100 year flood – depending on the specifications. It is never done to the maximum possible because we do not know what it is! And of course we can only estimate the 250 year flood! This is touched on later so I presume the author is aware of this, but the text should be clarified.

“a statistical viewpoint would result in more balanced security, i.e., more security for a better price.” I think that you mean a higher or larger price. Most people would think of a better price as cheaper! But I do not think that is what is meant!

To what does Achatschitz refer on page 3? It is not in the references.

P Is this work acceptable in its present form?

Yes  No

Q What is your final recommendation?

1 minor revision?

2 moderate revision?

3 major revision?

4 rejection?

*minor* = phrasing, clarity of figures, references, small additions, or removals; *moderate* = restructuring, revision of argument or interpretation, but can be achieved without new data; *major* = requires new data or major reinterpretation but has data of value and can realistically be saved; *reject* = cannot be saved.

*Please ensure that your final evaluation accords with your answers to the questions, especially should you be considering major revision or rejection.*

Thank you. Your co-operation is much appreciated.

---

Date:

Name (printed and signed):