

---

**Subject:** Manuscript # JASIST-2014-04-0259 – Decision for Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology

---

**From:** bcronin@indiana.edu (bcronin@indiana.edu)

---

**To:** pwilsonofc@btinternet.com;

---

**Cc:** meghann@jeditorial.com;

---

**Date:** Friday, 16 May 2014, 21:58

---

16-May-2014

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Your manuscript # JASIST-2014-04-0259 entitled "IV in PIM: The Applicability of Intrinsic Value in Personal Information Management" which you submitted to the Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, has been refereed and, I am sorry to say, will not be accepted for publication.

The referees' comments are appended to this letter and referees' attached comments (if any) are linked from Manuscript Central (from your Submitting Author Dashboard in Manuscript Central by selecting Manuscripts with Decisions and clicking on view decision letter).

Thank you for considering the Journal of the Association of Information Science and Technology for the publication of your research. I hope the outcome of this specific contribution will not discourage you from submitting other manuscripts in the future.

Sincerely,

Blaise Cronin

Professor Blaise Cronin  
Editor-in-Chief  
Journal of the Association of Information Science and Technology

Referees' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

The issue of managing personal information is critically important, given the ubiquity of personal papers in traditional and digital forms. Indeed, there is a healthy research community emerging around specifying the theories and best practices for personal digital archiving. This paper advances neither the state of this research nor an objective understanding of the PIM problem or its possible solutions. The author's analysis of the NARA guidelines on Intrinsic Value does not draw on the context of the NARS circular from 1982, is not grounded in published literature that comments and reviews the NARS circular, and is not grounded in more recent thinking about digitization as a preservation strategy. The author notes that the NARS circular from 1982 was designed largely to guide the agency in retaining items after microfilming (later digitization), rather than guiding the agency in the management of physical versus film/digital decision making. The author's initial categorization of criteria, derived from combining the

NARS criteria and criteria for digitization or not digitizing documents extracted from outdated literature and a UNC masters thesis, represent a misreading of the NARS circular. The author is not arms length in the analysis, given his use of personal, eclectic, and relatively valueless (except to him) collection of paper and digital files. As a result, the emerging criteria for PIM are personal, eclectic and of relatively little usefulness beyond the confines of the author's personal collection. The most compelling argument for the troubling nature of this article is the fact that in Table 13, fully half of the "Reasons for Keeping Originals" listed are derived from the author's personal judgment of his personal collection. As much as this reviewer would like to see a sophisticated and insightful analysis of the past and future of the NARS circular on Intrinsic Value, this paper will not fit that purpose.

Reviewer: 2

#### Comments to the Author

This paper investigates criteria that individuals may use to decide whether the originals of information items should be kept after they have been digitized. This is a very interesting research question and relevant to JASIST readers. The author showed that the NARS' Intrinsic Value criteria developed in the 80's can provide a starting point for individuals to consider what originals to retain in their personal information environment. But the paper's main contribution may be just that, -- "a starting point." The experimental methods and results do not justify a convincing conclusion that these criteria were useful and indeed used by owners of the information items.

The author described three experiments in this paper. In each case, the selected items were assessed against the NARS IV criteria to determine whether any of the criteria matched the reasons that the items were retained. However, the authors did not provide any details on how the assessment was made and who made the assessment. Without a detailed and solid description of the research methodology and data collection process, the data are less convincing.

I am also puzzled by the results as well. In all the three cases, the rate that an IV criterion was chosen for the reason of retention is less than 25% on average. This does not seem to suggest "usefulness" of the criteria. One would expect that "the adjust criteria" (the updated PIMRC) would improve the rate, this was not a clear case either based on the results. This led me wonder why to start from the IV criteria in the first place. This research might prove that it would be better to summarize the criteria of retention from the raw data than to adopt the NARS IV criteria to the personal environment.

Overall, I would not think JASIST an appropriate venue for publishing this paper. Some other journals (more related to archival studies) might be more pertinent to the experimental methods and results reported here.

If there are referee comments attached, they can be accessed from your Submitting Author Dashboard by selecting Manuscripts with Decisions and clicking on view decision letter.