# Review of preliminary analytical tools on GBIF portal.

*20140709 DanBIF / Isabel Calabuig*

All graphs were found to be very useful for one purpose or another – congratulations on launching this tool, we look very much forward to see it develop and to use it!

Here are the suggestions that I, on behalf of DanBIF, have submitted through the feedback button on a number of pages: <http://analytics.gbif-uat.org/country/DK/publishedBy/index.html#js-occurrence-species> .

Please note that these suggestions also apply to the graphs concerning data published ABOUT Denmark, but it was too cumbersome to submit them all twice.

* Yes, we strongly support that reports should be available as a download e.g. for insertion in internal reports to funders etc
* All graphs should state in a legend which country is the publisher.
* Graphs should display the other kingdoms separately as well, not only Animalia and Plantae – important in connection with focussed data mobilisation efforts within specific kingdoms, e.g. fungi, and themes such as marine plankton.
* The right-side-menu with occurrence trends links should be visible all the way down when jumping from section to section, right below a “back to top”-link.
* The subtitle under “XX country data trends should be much more prominent to avoid misunderstanding of whether its data from or about the country
* Colours: In general, the colour schemes for the brown, green and dark blue graphs are too close to each other in hue, e.g. for observations versus specimens in the same graph. (*The colour palettes come from colourbrewer2.org and an attempt was made to select colours that would be colour-blind safe. It is difficult to find suitable colour palettes that work on all charts (e.g. global and country specific) and input would be greatly appreciated to help improve these*).
* "by day of year" graphs should have months showing too - - the "day-number axis " is OK, but include also vertical gray lines separating the months and include month name on a second x-axis
* Time and seasonality: “Occurrence records by year of occurrence” and “Species by year of occurrence” should go back as far as there are records available on GBIF – otherwise we totally miss out on the historical records from the older collections! Very important when e.g. wanting to apply for funding for digitisation, to show the gap of records compared to what we know are in the collections.
* Geographic coverage for recorded species: Please include historical records all the way back, otherwise we miss out on the digitised historical collections!!
* Completeness on basis of record: I suspect the completeness of records seems low because for many datasets from denmark, the basis of record (specimen / observation) is only indicated on the metadata level in the IPT. Is this true?
* If you have suggestions of which charts should be added to the country pages, please provide these using the feedback button on the side of each page. The following has been submitted by DanBIF to include on country pages:
  + Please include "number of occurrence records" charts in country page - a separate graph for each of the kingdoms.
  + Please include "species counts" charts in country page - a common and also separate graph for each of the kingdoms.
  + Please include Time and seasonality charts for “Occurrence records by year of occurrence” and for “Species by year of occurrence”
  + Geographic coverage for recorded species - include on country page the one on a 0.1 degree scale
  + Please include on country page: Origin of occurrence records published by Denmark as well as about Denmark