Inna, As always, thank you for the strong efforts here, and for bringing such a complex technology into a still relatively-brief review. Your introduction clearly states the essential components of the argument that will follow, which are exactly the components expected here. In the section on the user base, the mission statement actually seems a bit superfluous: so many of these can be so vague and your information about the user needs is ample justification. Your background about LOD, including the important distinction of the “open” in that equation, is well-considered and appropriately-toned as background for the implementation that follows. If you needed to compress the text, you could probably encapsulate the stages of implementation, perhaps even into an appendix, to get to the most important section of evaluation sooner. In that most important content, the challenges are stated forthrightly (and you could give a sense for how the libraries are seeking greater consistency in the data); your benefits are well-stated especially considering the lucid background above, and the point about the implementation leading to policy revisions is *much* more telling than perhaps you realize, to the eyes of a potential administrator reading the report. Thank you once again.
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