

Review Form Response

Review FOSS4G Academic Track Submission

This form is for reviewing a FOSS4G Academic Track Submission.

Remarks to the editors *

The rejection is based on lack of structure and purpose for FOSS4G. As the moment this is more a student report for a GIS project.

Remarks to the author

FOSS4G 2013

Open source in accessibility analyses: Modelling of street petrol station accessibility in Germany

The abstract is explicit but the acronym SGI is not explained and 2/3 of the abstract is about the motivation of evaluating accessibility rather than how your open source modelling helped in that way.

In the mean time the 1/3 left to describe your approach is more technical: listing the open source tools used but doesn't say much about the method itself. If the method is based on a standard short path analysis and/or regional science models, this has to be said in the abstract whilst comparing OSM data to other commercial routing network serves becomes then the major objective of the research.

Rewriting the abstract may be necessary also to avoid repetitive arguments.

In the introduction the analysis is described using the list of open source tools/database system without saying much about the analysis itself (data needed and processing needed, and where does exist in commercial GIS desktop).

What is departmental research. Basically the research study/ development is not much more introduced in the introduction that it is in the abstract.

What does the raster represents? density of roads? density of petrol stations? nb of petrol station per BBSRKreistypen (vector rerasterized)

Th euse of raster and then OSM data is a bit confusing, not well explained.

Is the petrol station data open data?

This is altogether barely structured badly written and looks more like a 2nd 3rd year student report on a GIS project.

For a conference you need to extract and structure your method and findings and provide a clear idea of what your work bring to the community here the Free and Open Source Software for Geospatial studies.

The section 7 is nonetheless interesting (badly written but interesting) but you have to be careful of discussing/making conclusion about things you have done in the previous sections.

Recommendation *

- Strong Accept and recommendation for inclusion in Transactions in GIS
- Strong Accept
- Weak Accept
- Reject

Close

* Denotes required field