

IRUG DB Reviewers Meeting

29 March 2006, Museum of Modern Art, New York

11 West 53rd Street, Room 10A

Attending:

J. Douglas, K. Duffy, K. Helwig, H. Khanjian, T. Lasseter Clare, J. Mass, R. Newman, M. Picollo, B. Pretzel, B. Price, M. Schreiner, K. Sutherland, D. Thickett, M. Tsukada, S. Williams, B. Zhadanov

Regrets:

J. Bischoff, J. Carlson, M. Mimura, M. Ormsby, Y. Sasaki, M. Sato, S. Watts, S. Lake

6:00–7:30 pm

Meeting with pizza...

Website Software Overview

Database and bibliography search, submission and review, discussion forum, and account management tools

Reviewer's Software and Editing Discussion

Some considerations:

1. User manual feedback – Is it useful? How can it be improved?

2. Spectra quality and accuracy issues encountered by reviewers:

Baseline (negative and sloping), noise, collection beyond detector limits, totally absorbing bands (detector overload), signal intensity, interference fringes, water bands

Misidentified materials, impurities, class misassignments, lack of sample and sample prep information (encourage contributors to be as complete as possible!)

Transmittance spectra (absorbance only)

3. Title line

Order for title line is: ##TITLE=[IRUG filename] [Common/trade name] [sample source] [sample identifier] [institution acronym] [collection mode (tran, refl, scat)].

There is an 80-character limit. Since ##TITLE=[IRUG filename] takes up 17 characters, 63 characters are left for the rest of the description. Since priorities for the title line are common

IRUG DB Reviewers Meeting

29 March 2006, Museum of Modern Art, New York

11 West 53rd Street, Room 10A

name, institution acronym, and collection mode, the selection and order of common names is important, e.g., OD reviewers agreed that the “common name” for OD spectra should comprise the CI name and class (PV19, Quinacridone Violet). Because of space constraints, the manufacturer’s trade names were omitted.

4. Bugs in software

Character limits in submission boxes

Numbers only in mp box

Others?

5. Miscellaneous questions:

Should reviewer accept problem spectra that are unique/not in the DB?

Should reviewer directly contact the submitter to get more information?

Should reviewer supply missing information such as mp, mw, and formula?

Would it help to see your counterpart reviewer’s comments and votes?

Should there be an official cutoff date for submission of spectra to leave ample time for reviewers to review and edit?

Would it help to have a Reviewer’s Meeting before the next Biennial IRUG meeting?

Reviewer Assignments

Goodbye and thank you! (Board meeting will follow directly)