Table 2. Differences between tDAR and Open Context

Characteristic	tDAR	Open Context	Implications/Recommendations
Access Restrictions	**Contents of data files can be restricted OR public** Restriction options: Limit contents viewing/downloading to specific users. AND/OR Temporary embargo (up to 4 years)	**Contents of ALL data files are public (site coordinates can be masked)** No access restrictions to specific users or embargo options are available.	If any data content cannot be made public due to publisher restrictions or other legal or research-related concerns, tDAR is optimal. If access restrictions are unnecessary, either repository could be optimal.
File Types Accepted	**Virtual: Remote Sensing Files, 3D scans** **Geospatial: Shapefiles, GeoTIFF/GeoJPG, Geodatabases** Text: .pdf, .doc/.docx, .rtf, .text Datasets: .csv, .tab, .xls/.xlsx, .accdb/.mdb Images: .tiff/.tif, .gif, .jpg/.jpeg, .bmp, .pict, .png	**Virtual: GIS and specialized datasets (CADD, remote sensing, 3D point clouds) accessioned as digital objects, not for live processing or visualizations.** Text: .pdf, .doc/.docx Datasets:.xls/.xlsx preferred. Also accept Filemaker, .accdb/.mdb, .odf, .csv.	If data includes remote sensing files, 3D scans and point clouds, or geospatial data, and the current or future usefulness of the data is enhanced by ability to manipulate, process or re-visualize, then tDAR is optimal. Otherwise, either could be optimal. If unsure, consult repository staff about a project's special file types.
Data Record Organization and Retrieval	**Records, metadata and persistent identifiers assigned and searchable at project/dataset/file level only, NOT at individual artifact (dataset contents) level.**	**Records, metadata and persistent identifiers assigned and searchable at project/dataset/file level, AND at individual artifact (dataset contents) level.**	Individual artifacts can be viewed and compared within Open Context's search/browse interface, for more immediate discovery and comparison of relevant dataset contents and projects. In tDAR, project dataset files must be downloaded and opened to view individual artifact records.
Data Description and Comparative Integration	**Comparison and integration requires ontologies, created and applied by data depositor or user. If ontology already exists, integrating data and downloading as new dataset is intuitive. However, amount of data**	**Uses Linked Data standards, consistently applied metadata and standardized data description fields throughout contents of all data sets. However, downloading and creating**	Either can be acceptable, depending on archaeology data type (ie. faunal, ceramic, architectural, etc.) and goals for future data comparison/integration. If ontology exists in tDAR for the data type, this could be preferable; if ontology does not exist for the data type, Open Context can introduce a level of standardization and

	description and metadata, and ability to integrate, is inconsistent between projects and data types.	**new, integrated datasets is not intuitive.**	comparison not possible in tDAR. Linked Data approach may facilitate cross-web comparisons to Open Context data.
Editorial Control	**No mention of editorial control or peer review requirements prior to acceptance and ingest.** However, they reserve the right to remove content that does not conform to accession policy and standards.	**Includes varying levels of peer review and editorial control/review, performed prior to acceptance.** Level of peer review received by a project is indicated in project data records.	tDAR uses a traditional digital repository model. It can more easily handle fragmentary or incomplete records, and deposit by third parties. Open Context uses a scholarly publication model. It is ideal for primary research datasets and related documents and files. Peer review may allow depositors to claim as scholarly output; secondary users have assurance of quality and soundness of data.
Holdings size/ # of Contributors (as of 01/13/2015)	**Contains 741 projects; 774 datasets** Partnered with National Park Service to import records from the National Archaeological Database	**Contains 54 projects (# of datasets cannot be easily determined)** DINAA project includes records from state agency/organizations in Kentucky, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Virginia, Missouri, Alabama	Larger holdings size can indicate greater use by discipline, more sustainable and greater visibility. tDAR has larger number of discrete archaeological projects than Open Context, although both have partnered with National/State agencies in addition to accepting individual research projects.
Geographic Coverage (as of 01/13/2015)	**Primary strength: North America (approx 90% from United States)** Secondary: Europe, Middle East	**Primary strengths: Middle East (approx 80% from Jordan, Turkey, Iran); North America** Secondary: Europe, Asia, Africa	Opportunities for comparative research, discovery and reuse may increase if deposited with data from similar region/cultural group. Compare project attributes to repository holdings at time of deposit.