

3D Digital Dossiers - a new way of presenting cultural heritage on the Web

A. Eliëns, Y. Wang, C. van Riel, T. Scholte

General comments The reviewers were to our opinion quite divergent in their appreciation of our style of writing and presentation, as well as the relevance of our contribution. Considering that we had to reduce the paper into a short paper of 4 pages, we could not discuss some of the topics as extensively as we would have liked to do, and accordingly we could not accommodate all reviewers' wishes.

Due to reasons of exposition we reduced the number of sections, re-organised some of the material, and eliminated, for example, all discussion of future research.

Having discussed the necessary changes, we also decided include an addition author.

reviewer 1 Although we had to shorten our discussion of content management significantly, we gratefully included the reference to the CIDOC CRM proposal, as a possible alternative for Dublin Core

reviewer 2 We do not share the opinion of the reviewer that 3D is not necessary, and the reviewer does apparently not take into account our discussion in the section usability and presentation issues, where we emphasize the notion of immersion.

We do however, although we shortened the discussion of visualisation paradigms, include, gratefully, a reference to the Ivan et al. reference, which bgives an overview of graph visualisation techniques.

Due to space limitations, we skipped all reference to future research.

reviewer 3 This reviewer seems to be somewhat antagonistic to our research, as well our style of writing and exposition. We tried to avoid spelling mistakes, and as before considered our choices of composition with care.

Due to space limitations we significantly reduced our discussion of cultural heritage research, and maintained only, due to our familiarity with the it, a reference to a Dutch collection of projects executed in the CATCH framework. We also kept the list of main problems we identified.

We belief that we have presented the motivation for presenting navigation graphs in 3D sufficiently by our discussion of immersive presentation, that even had to be reduced, again, due to space limitations.

Given the situation that we used generally available 3D technology, we consider the objection that we also should allow for, for example Quicktime VR, unfair and not relevant.

In the original long paper, we actually did describe content management. But in the short paper, we omitted most of this material.

The reviewer makes an interesting distinction between meta data and meta information, and professes a preference for meta data. Considering that INCCA explicitly does only provide information about information, meant for curators, and not the information itself, we think that the phrase meta information is more appropriate, since meta data strongly invokes the association with search engines instead of human information consumers.

in conclusion We hope that the modifications will be approved by the program committee, and we thank the reviewers, even if we do not agree with all their criticisms, for their constructive contributions to our paper.