



# Evaluation Report for

## TEBT-2024-0011

### Submission information table

Submission Title	An Environmental Heath Vocabulary and its Semi-Automated Curation Workflow
Submission Reference	TEBT-2024-0011
Handling Editor	Paul Whaley   ORCID 0000-0003-4021-0785
Number of Reviewers	Round 1: 2 plus comments from editor Round 2: 1 re-review plus comments from editor
Submission Type	Methodology ▾
Preprint DOI	<a href="https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.11176258">https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.11176258</a>
Evaluation Stage	Peer-Review ▾
Evaluation Round	Round 2 ▾
Evaluation Date	4 Mar 2025
Recommendation	Revise ▾

### Editor's Summary of Comments

The reviewers and editor are satisfied with the overall revisions and have made some minor suggestions that relate to improving the clarity of the manuscript.

<b>Seriousness of remaining issues identified in the described work</b>	Remaining issues with the manuscript are minor.
<b>Amount of additional work potentially required to overcome remaining issues</b>	The revisions for clarity should take no more than a few hours.
<b>Acceptability of characterising remaining limitations instead of doing additional work</b>	The issues are minor and should not need characterising in terms of limitations.

## Reviewer and Editor comments

*Reviewer comments are lightly edited and aggregated into the structure below by the Handling Editor*

### **General comments**

1. The manuscript is considerably improved, with comprehensive changes in response to my comments. It is acceptable for publication but I have suggested some revisions to improve clarity.
2. A limitation in my comments is that the authors have presented a very detailed overview of a workflow that I am not directly involved with, so it may be the case that some limitations in the account given are not apparent to me. On the whole, however, I feel that I can interpret the processes the authors are describing into an operational process. The high level of detail appears appropriate for what is being communicated.
3. The authors addressed all my comments. I just list a few minor revisions that could improve clarity.

### ***Remaining issues that could materially impact the scientific quality of the described work***

No issues identified.

### ***Other remaining issues with the described work***

4. The subheading structure is inconsistently formatted and therefore confusing (e.g. "Introduction" is in all caps but is presumably intended to be a same-level heading as "Methodology" - yet this heading is not in all caps and is a different colour; "Workflow overview" reads almost like a caption, but it is in the introduction - is it a subsection of

the intro?). I would suggest revisions to make sure the reader can follow the hierarchy of sections.

5. Some paragraphs seem a little redundant. For example, the paragraph beginning at line 140 seems to repeat some (though not all) of the points made in the paragraph beginning line 122. The paragraph at line 175 seems to also cover some of this same territory. It is not a massive issue, but in a long manuscript where the purpose is to clearly and succinctly explain a process and its motivation to a reader, some further tightening up of the flow of the manuscript would be beneficial. I would suggest the authors do a comprehensive final check for redundancy and conciseness, just to get things nice and tight.
6. The figures are a major improvement and in my opinion illustrate the flows very well. (I also note that figure 1a clarifies some aspects of the EHV hierarchy which I have been struggling with myself, in a project integrating chemical assessment data from multiple sources including HAWC into a single new database. We struggled with figuring out if we wanted to use “system”, “effect”, or “endpoint” data. The explanation the figure provides for this is very helpful.)
7. The citations appear to need to be updated to match the references in the work, I think?
8. Lines 102-107: It's difficult to follow this sentence due to the use of urls within the text. Consider making these citations and then describe what Makris 2009 is referring to in order to make this sentence clearer.
9. I would suggest putting workflow orientation (lines 123-) under Methodology not Introduction.
10. Line 149: The investigators state that terms are sorted into 3 groups. But based on the figure 2, it appears that Group 1 consists of all the terms which are then sorted into Group 2 (match EHV) or Group 3 (no match). So I think it would be clearer if the text matched the figure to describe one group being split into two rather than all of the terms being split into three.
11. Line 386: Sentence starting "Through iterative EHV is curation, it is expected.." isn't clear. Did you mean, "Through iterative curation of the EHV, it is.." or something else?

***Other questions and comments about the described work***

No other comments.