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Technical partners

EERQI is an ICT-driven project:

• Berlin School of Library and Information Science at Humboldt-Universität (B-SLIS)
• Institute for Science Networking Oldenburg (ISN)
• Xerox Research Centre Europe, Grenoble
• Regional Computing Centre for Lower Saxony of the Leibniz University of Hanover (RRZN)
• Radboud University, ITS
• University of Lund, University Libraries

www.eerqi.eu
Work done

- EERQI-website has been designed and launched
Work done

An internal website has been set up as common workspace. Instruments for internal communication (e.g. a Wiki, Web DAV) have been set up and tested.
Work done

- An aggregated, federated content base has been set up, including collections of several electronic resources like journal articles, monographs, and book chapters in the languages English, German, French and Swedish).

- More than 2 GByte of full text is available.

- Documents have been analysed pertaining to formats, availability, metadata, reliable log files, restrictions, etc.
Work done

- A search and query engine has been developed and already been implemented with a user interfaces in English, French, Swedish and German, giving access to:
  - Publication on the web in fulltext,
  - Metadata and two-line snipetts of publications in the content base.
Work done

- Part of the EERQI search engine has been opened to the public and is available on the project website.

- The prototype search engine has also been integrated into the German meta search engine www.metager.de.
Work in progress

- A testing methodology for indicator verification has been suggested.
- The methodological principle is to compare the validity of automatically generated statistics (like citation and usage statistics) with human assessments in a peer review process.
- We are scrutinizing, whether automatically generated statistics can be used as probabilistic indicators of quality, when they are considered in combination and in a sufficient quantity.
Details on the Evaluation Process

- **Goals:**
  - Configuration and optimization of the automatic quality checking implementation
  - Evaluation of the whole workflow
Review of Journals

Step 1:
• Build a testing corpus of 4 x 100 articles of
  • 6 – 10 pages length,
  • 2 – 10 year age (with the majority from 2006),
  • in the four project languages:
    • German
    • English
    • French
    • Swedish

Step 2:
• Crosscheck by the Scientists in the project, that articles are from the field and potentially of relevance.
Review of Journals

Step 3: in progress
• Find reviewers for the articles (each article needs at least 4 reviews)
• Build a matrix, who should review which article

Step 4:
• Build a questionnaire in progress
  • Build the list of questions
  • Build an online tool to support the review process
Review of Journals (Questionnaire)

A Project funded under the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities Theme.

www.eerqi.eu
Review of Publications

Step 5: can start after finishing of the intellectual review
- Customizing and optimizing the automatic evaluation tools

Step 6:
- Run the evaluation tools on the content base (non-open access articles, books, inserts, etc.)

Step 7:
- Evaluate the results by scientists from the project.

Step 8:
- Customize and optimize the automatic evaluation tools
  (Steps 7 and 8 may be recurse several times)

Step 9:
- Include the evaluation tools into the search engine harvester and run it on new media (like blogs, twitter channels etc.)
Indicators for the Algorithms

- Usage (OA vs. Non-OA!)
- References (DOARC project)
- Institutions (danger of circular reasoning)
- Review indicators (at least 100 document fulltexts for all quality levels and languages)
- Formal criteria (more usable for automatic distinguishing the genres and formats), is Readability also one?
- Originality/Significance and Rigour (do we have batches of good and bad examples?)
Next steps

- We need your input:
  - List of Reviewers
  - Matrix who should review what
  - Final version of questionnaire
  - List of relevant journals
  - List of professional institutions
  - Usage data of OA publications
  - Usage data of publications
  - Translated texts for the web server
Thank you for your attention

For further questions:
- Severiens@isn-oldenburg.de
- Jenny.Oltersdorf@ibi.hu-berlin.de