Comments relating to products in the University of Cambridge ELN Trial, July-August 2017.

Q8: Please rate the user interface design.

LABARCHIVES

• Easy to use a similar to a pc but not a visually pleasing as others
• Initially I hated the cluttered look of labarchives; however, the ease of use was excellent. Makes it very easy to add content straight from the start - I like the mixed content pages and being able to move items up and down easily. Hover menu icons and pop-ups are not visually appealing, but are very functional. Separate items e.g. daily entries and attachments are easy to distinguish.
• Simple but effective and intuitive design with folders on the left-hand side and highlighted entries showing up in the main screen. Meant it was easy to switch between pages, and could add new results in just a couple of clicks. Upon login, it defaulted to the last page worked on which was useful. Right-clicking on pages gave several useful options.
• Very intuitive for the basics, I consulted the help pages for some of the more advanced options and they were very helpful. Widgets are brilliant and the interface for their creation was straightforward and all steps explained as you went.
• It's great as all folders are on the side bar, which makes easier to navigate between the project (similar set up to OneNote - which is big advantage). Its' functional but it would be great if it's more colourful - more modern design.
• From some of the other eLabnotebooks, this one appealed to me for its sensible design. It's not trying to be flashy or overtly modern in its layout, but everything is methodical, sensible, and writing entries is so straightforward.
• Overall the interface design is very good, though there are many very minor issues. Most of these relate to the iOS and android apps; in both of these, editing RTFs with full html markup reduces the available writing space such that only a single line is visible at a time. Widgets are not supported in the mobile apps, and there are a couple of other features that require launching the normal webpage within the app rather than running them natively. Also, in the mobile apps it takes several button-presses to add a new page; while trivial, this is annoying for something that you need to do frequently.

RSPACE

• Nice and straightforward - felt easy to use
• Very counterintuitively designed. Not used friendly. Also has a lot of redundancies.
• This is the nicest looking lab notebook of the three I tested. Opening page was clean and clear although if there was a lot of entries, it would have become difficult to find items; perhaps the tree interface would be a better default view. It is a bit frustrating having to find the small pencil icon to switch from 'view' to 'edit' mode - also should be made easier to distinguish which mode you are in, e.g. view mode page could have grey background etc. When in view mode, text isn't selectable so when I want to copy a section into another entry, it needs to be opened in edit mode to select & copy. Sometimes RSpace hangs while saving an entry.
• Navigating experiments within lab notebook etc is fine, but tabs from home interface not intuitive.
• too many clicks to get into lab notebooks.
• This was so intuitive, no manual required.
SCINOTE

- Handy but still improving
- I didn't like that upon startup, it opened on the home 'project' screen regardless of what you had previously been working on and required multiple clicks through to specific projects and then experiments to add data. The boxes for each project were not big enough to display the full project titles I had and the sizes could not be changed. The workflow diagrams were a nice idea but quite slow to create, and the fact that everything had to be a part of that, with associated protocols, meant there was no space to add notes that didn't neatly fit into a specific project.
- The experiment design flow chart is a great feature, however it feels forced upon the user and gets in the way of entering info into a lab journal. Takes way too many clicks to add simple daily notes to current experiment. For example 5 clicks/pageloads to add a record to the demo experiment: Demo_project_qpcr > my_first_experiment > qpcr > results > add_new_result(_text)
- Not as intuitive as it could have been. In fact sciNote was meant to be our main product to test but was so user unfriendly and unsuitable for what we needed that the whole lab group gave up on using it further and instead started using a different elab book.
- I find it nice and modern, but this is subjective.
- A bit rigid

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK

- Very easy to get started with - clear sections / easy to navigate.
- Clean and intuitive, but few options for customisation
- One of the major problems with building electronic substitutions is that half of the time it's built by people who've never used a paper equivalent.
Q9: Please rate the workflow suitability.

LABARCHIVES

- The design is very flexible, allows this ELN to be used exactly as a traditional lab notebook, or as a much wider system for incorporating all your files for a project into one interface. "Sign pages' worked very well. Only negative point i can think of is that it was too much of a blank canvas - made it difficult to decide how to organise my lab book.
- Simple and customisable. I had different projects in different folders and then added pages and files to those based on date - but you could just as easily create one page and have a diary of text more like a conventional lab book. Liked not having to perform multiple clicks to access results and add new content. Able to link to other pages - for example a protocol page which is useful.
- Very straightforward, has sections for planning etc. The only criticism would be a lack of a means of setting up a daily to-do list.
- It's pretty good. It's possible to introduce simple text or more reach text, there's a lot of calculation formula. You can attach documents. All what is needed.
- Import of any other file formats than Microsoft Office documents is not possible. No GeneBank files or image files, which means that for me, who does a lot of molecular coning and microscopy, this ELN does not help my workflow (however, I had a look at other ELNs, too, and it seems that this problem is not unique to LabArchives).
- The workflow of this system is quite customizable, and has suited my work well. However, it is not always easy to link to a specific entry in the notebook, especially if you use a single page to contain multiple entries, such as datasets or protocols etc (also, it's really not easy to find the button to make links!). That said, there are alternative ways of using the notebook that make this easier, relying on the use of more individual pages.

RSPACE

- Almost identical to what one would ordinarily do in a normal notebook
- Adding items is simple, however each page is limited to a single entry type - i.e. it becomes difficult to mix text notes, spreadsheet data and pdf uploads, which i frequently need to do.

SCINOTE

- Complex - would probably put many users off
- I originally liked the idea of the workflow diagrams you could create, but we struggled to think about how best to use this for our day-to-day experiments, where we more commonly repeat the same experiment type but with different samples, rather than follow a chain of different experiments. We felt using this created unnecessary complications, and made adding a quick note of a result rather cumbersome.
- Workflows are a nice touch, although in practice adding steps takes a lot of extra time, when my work usually consists of linear experiments.
- Not useful for our workflow at all, can see how it might be OK for some work but not really useful for wet lab experiments.
- If you have many projects it would be difficult to navigate between them, to have a list of folders rather than bog icons on the screen would be a much better solution. The LabArchive seems to have a better solution. Its's not that easy to navigate between different experiments. Not the easiness interface.
• The graphical representation of the workflow is very nice. The workflow is not necessarily linear in the sense that you can have several branches. Everything has to “fit” into: 1. An experiment 2. then a task 3. and finally within a task you can add protocol steps, results or samples. It is difficult for me to judge whether it is a good thing, but I wonder if you always need to break down experiments to that granularity. You cannot write anything directly into a task except for a title, you have to add a sub-layer (if that make sense). For each task there is a results tab, a sample tab, and a report tab.

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK

• I think this would be very useful as a repository for data / notes on finished projects or for public data for preprints etc. As a standard notebook for ongoing projects, I'm not so sure - the wiki is not the easiest to edit / search. Good file storage though.

• Helpful for linking together information in different locations, but not a drastic improvement over existing methods. (Note we are a computational lab anyway, so all our data and tools are already online.)
Q10: Please rate the content creation tools.

LABARCHIVES

- Pros: Plain text, rich text attachments and spreadsheets etc were all very intuitive and could be added quickly without migrating to another page. The links to another entry or webpage were well implemented too, although once created, they are hard to see - larger icons or inline links would be nicer. Widgets were very promising. Cons: A button to insert current date would be a great addition. Adding .xlsx file via 'office documents' - they don't appear until page has been refreshed.

- Large array of content creation tools from text, office documents, equations. Ability to add attachments and interface with Prism files. Many widgets available, or possible to customise your own - would use a chemical database and freezer box management system if we were to implement this long term. Supports chemical structure additions.

- Annotation on gel images was great, drawing function OK - it gives you the basics, anything else you can always just use another program anyway.

- Good and intuitive

- An improved workflow, something like a sticky note would be helpful. Equally, a comment function. A major problem is also that neither the desktop version nor the tablet and smartphone app are usable without working internet connection. This vastly limits the usability.

- The content creation tools are very good. The Microsoft Office compatible tools seem to work well, though I haven't used them much. The embedded rich text editor is very powerful. It offers ease of use with a graphical interface, while also supporting html markdown for more advanced users. The one frustration is that a large amount of html markdown is not compatible with the system, presumably because of how it integrates with the website; this is mostly frustrating because it is clear that the text editor could be much more powerful than it currently is. Nonetheless, it does work well. Also, the ability to make widgets which can utilize far more code is really great. While most users won't use these features, it is great that they are there, since one person from a lab or institute could easily put together a widget that is shared around the group to benefit many.

RSPACE

- I thought that the creation tools can be improved in that annotating images and numbering could be made a little easier.

- The system does not allow two user to work on the same notebook entry at the same time and it is not always immediately obvious that it's the case! The text formatting is also rather weird.

- Text entry is clean and simple. An autodating function (or insert...date) would be very useful. Inline links are good. But to add a link to another page in lab book, you have to: close, find other page, copy link, reopen, reenter edit mode, paste link, save. It's much more simple in other ELNs tested. Built-in browser spellcheck is prevented from working properly in edit mode because right-click menu options are changed. New entry was limited to text.

SCINOTE

- Not easy to do annotation of regular scientific imaging and placing images is not particularly easy, especially if you have PDF images.

- Creation tools limited

- Currently fairly limited to text, table and file upload.
Text entry was clean and simple. File entry was made very easy via drag and drop. Creating simple spreadsheet could be slow as default sizes were limited - no option to select number of rows/columns at start.

Not many flexibility, do not meet all need. Difficult to create simple text, you have to choose the text box first. Not easy to read the experiment content.

You can add tables, check-lists. You can insert code (R, MATLAB, Python, JSON, HTML/XML, etc). I could not find any way to write mathematical equations or chemical structures. I could not find either any annotation or drawing tools.

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK

Does well with handling various file types / editing. The wiki is not the easiest to edit though or to search.

Wiki with previewer decent for basic content, but limited for more complicated content (formulas, etc.). Formulas, etc. are possible, but there are no tools or instructions for this and it requires quite a bit of trial and error.
**Q11: Please rate the file management features.**

**LABARCHIVES**
- Ability to add files and Prism projects and they appear on the page they have been added to. Might be nice to also have them appearing under a separate section of uploaded files. Can upload multiple files at once, and can highlight more than one file to add them to the upload queue. Upload speed reasonable, though didn't try with very large files.
- Can upload anything. Not all formats will display -in line- as it were, but image embedding was good and word document integration was good.
- Easy to navigate between different projects and panels. Easy to find answers in support materials. Many options
- I like this a lot. It flows just fine.
- I think the file management is fine, however, to use it as a microscopist, significantly more user space would be needed, additionally to the possibility to store many other file formats.
- Files are easy to upload, and edits are versioned. I haven't had to use the version control much. One thing I have noticed is that versioning is performed per-entry in any given page. While this is helpful, I expected the 'Page Tools' version tools to be able to revert everything in the page back to a given date, when in fact every item needs to be reverted individually. Generally this should not be much of an issue depending on how you choose to use the notebook however.

**RSPACE**
- Can be difficult to organise files.
- Icons were helpful, file upload options were hard to find.
- Not properly tested

**SCINOTE**
- File search was well implemented
- Not easy to manage the projects, not very intuitive.
- I uploaded Word and Excel, PDF, Pages files, images. The limit for each file is 50 MB. You can upload several at a time and the speed was satisfactory.
- Difficult to get used to it first, then ok

**OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK**
- Very good file storage, nice that it allows integration with other file storage systems like Google Drive / Github etc so these can be coordinated in one place. Easy management of folders / sections, also does version control.
- Decent internal file management, easy to link to Google Drive. Can view Google Drive files within OSF, but formatting not always conserved.
- I'm sure it organises things just fine for software engineers, but I'm not really sure the developers have spent any time actually using lab books or really talking and interacting with those at the bench.
Q12: Please rate the integration with other software and/or cloud services.

LABARCHIVES

- Nice to have the integration with Prism, as we use a lot of Prism files, though this may significantly increase the storage space used. Can also add word/excel files from within labarchives, but probably wouldn’t use this feature. Used the lab archives mobile app – again easy and simple to use - a good way of taking and uploading photos and checking on results.
- Integration with word was good. Integration with dropbox would be good but if the available file space is large enough on lab archives then it would be unnecessary.
- Very easy, and the link to the protocol could be used in papers - great design
- Integration with Dropbox or Google Drive or the university server space does not work. This is a critical problem for me since, as mentioned above, I cannot save or access image files, etc. through LabArchives.
- LabArchives has limited integration with other software or cloud services. I have used their folder monitor to upload certain files when they're updated on my computer, but I haven’t used their microsoft office plugin to save or load directly from the lab book. Other integrations haven't felt particularly necessary

RSPACE

- Was very impressed by extensive partnership with well-known scientific software
- Slack integration is very useful. Other options looked good, but untested.

SCINOTE

- Very little integration with other software
- ChemDraw files could not be integrated
- I thinks it works okay but I didn’t really try it out so I couldn't rate this as either good or bad.
- Integrated with Office but not drawing tools
- It was not to straight forward to make the PDF from the lab notebook and how to work offline. LabArchive is much better flexibility here again.
- Integration with Office applications is available. SciNote allows users to build their own custom repositories and link them to tasks. The repositories are simple databases (at present all fields are text fields, you cannot choose the data type, but this feature should be added in the future (at least for numbers).
- Tried only excel

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK

- Integrates with many different storage sites. Also with citation managers. 8/20/2017 3:09 PM
- Like all packages tested, and comparing to Microsoft onenote, the ability to save and manipulate a local file would be crucial to stand a chance as a ELN package to implement.
- Multiple options and generally good performance; some unresolved issues with Zotero integration.
Q13: Please rate the collaboration features.

LABARCHIVES
• Very simple to share with other lab-archives users and track activity Pages made visible by link appeared on google search - might be nicer to have the option to make these viewable with link but non-indexed.
• Not used extensively but I was able to view another lab member’s notebook and there are easy to use features which allow sharing of folders or pages with others, even those not part of labarchives. Others can easily add comments to your data.
• Widget sharing is a good idea
• Very good
• Not used, but it looks like the should work well, with the ability to comment on pages or individual entries, and share folders, pages and data as required with varying levels of permissions.

RSPACE
• Once again, cannot allow multiple people to edit a document at the same time (e.g. like Google Docs).
• Collaboration options seemed good, but not tested as no other Rspace users in group. Couldn’t find how to privately share documents with non-Rspace users (e.g. private link)

SCINOTE
• Appears to be good for multiple users working on the same project; different projects can allow different levels of permission.
• The only strong suit of this e-lab book
• Good

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK
• Easy to allow different people to access different parts of a project, including whether they are fully public or private.
• Anything involving large dataset is useful for the platform.
Q14: If you are supervising a group trial of this product, please rate the administrator features.

LABARCHIVES
• Easy to navigate between the projects and check quickly what was done

RSPACE
No comments received

SCINOTE
• Good but if you have many projects it would be better to have the list of folders rather than icons as it’s difficult to manage when you have 100 or more projects

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK
No comments received
Q15: Please rate the export features.

LABARCHIVES

- PDF was clear and indexed, although images perhaps too small.
- Export of entire notebook or just a section as a pdf, though this is not customisable and gives a blank page if you have empty folders. No blank space between entries within folders though which is good. Nice to have a table of contents page as part of the exported pdf.
- No problem exporting to PDF - I have been doing that to print out experiments to stick into my physical lab book.
- Very easy PDF export, possibility of working offline. Exported PDF have still LABARchive features - easy to navigate
- The problem lies rather with the import features.
- Exporting to PDF appears to work very well and should be suitable for long-term accessibility and is printer friendly.

RSPACE

- PDF export was well formatted, included link to original entries, and update metadata.

SCINOTE

- Reports were awful - apparently something under development
- Seems to work well
- Able to create report from notes
- Allows some customisation of pdf export but too much white space between entries to be useful.
- Can export to pdf
- Easy, but not in PDF
- Experiments can be exported in .eln format, repositories in .csv, reports in .pdf.

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK

- Easy to download any of the stored files. There didn’t appear to be an easy way to export wiki pages (e.g. as pdfs)
- Could not figure out how to export
Q16: What missing features, if any, would you prefer to see included in this product?

LABARCHIVES

• For big pages, revisions list can take a long time to open; and it doesn't show any progress bar or loading icon.
• Ability to track samples/mutants showing in which experiments they were used, perhaps putting them all in a database which could be accessed by other collaborators - though this could be partially done by using tags.
• I would improve on the website colours to make it more modern and more colourful
• Dropbox integration, import of more file formats to store, document and archive molecule files, images, videos, etc. Also missing is offline editing and online syncing of content generated on any device when offline.
• It would be great to have widgets on the mobile pages, as the at-a-glance layout of these for

RSPACE

• Drawing package
• Like all packages tested, and comparing to Microsoft onenote, the ability to save and manipulate a local file would be crucial to stand a chance as a ELN package to implement.
• Aesthetically more pleasing user interface
• 1) Collaboration & real-time multiple user editing of documents 2) More intuitive file management system
• Single pages which comprised of multiple entries - e.g. a new section for each day, and spreadsheets, graph data, pdfs etc.

SCINOTE

• Software integration
• Integration with other software such as ChemDraw
• 1. Ability to work offline and have a software to install locally. 2. Ability to be a bit more hands on with text editing.
• Drawing tools on pictures added
• It is not useful if you want to use it as a labbook writing everyday what you have been doing.
• The original 'trailer' for the product showed extra modules that you could use and edit etc, the actual product didn't have any of these. Having these modules would be great.
• The layout is not the best, the list of folders and experiments rather then icons would be much better solution, it's very easy to read
• My work is not always experiment-based, so this ELN was kind of restricted compare to the others when it comes to content creation and workflow due to the nature of my work. It made my work with it much harder as a result and it's hard for me to make specific suggestions, when my main need is for a different design (the other ones were a lot more inclusive and allowed me to start more easily and on many different nature projects -eg grants, clinical trials etc)
• A text editor with more feature (like the integration of Latex as in RSpace). The possibility to create folders to put documents that do not necessarily form part of a workflow.
• This product does not address the "diary-like" property of a lab book.
• To be able to make a small database of samples/results and choose them for different projects
• It was missing an easy method to record day to day activity in the lab that didn’t involve set experiments. For example, meetings, production of buffers etc

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK
• I’d prefer a more classic notebook like interface - the wiki is not very flexible / can’t be searched awfully easily. It’s great to make official Readme type documents for finished projects / preprints, but for ongoing work this is not so great.
• Customisation of home page
• Ability to run on local server
Q17: If you believe this product's function was compromised by deficient local services or infrastructure, why?

LABARCHIVES
- A tablet or laptop to keep in the lab would make any (and all) of the the e-lab books more useful.
- Yes. Many devices here are not connected to the internet or a local network but. This means that most data and documentation cannot easily be transferred to LabArchives (or cloud services or servers). But also, many systems come with their proprietary file formats, so even if they were connected, I could not use them with LabArchives. This means that for many things, hand-written notes or print-outs from a specific computer are still the most time efficient and convenient way to record data.

RSPACE
- Require both cloud and local service to make this and all products to work
- Possibly - for example if all local

SCINOTE
- No, everything seemed to run smoothly and effectively
- No, I just think it is more suitable for data management and not for a daily basis labbook.
- A tablet or laptop to keep in the lab would make any (and all) of the the e-lab books more useful.

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK
No comments received
Q18: Do you have any other comments about this product?

LABARCHIVES

- Mobile app was good - not obvious how to log in at first though. Text in android app was way too large when in view mode (looked fine when editing)
- Would need plenty of storage space to use it to its full extent.
- If I knew that the university was trialling for longer then I would have put some more time into the initial widget set up so that it covered the majority of my routine experiments/routine steps within experiments. I think that this would make lab archives even better and the sharing of these 'standard custom widgets' would ensure that data collection and analysis is more consistent across a group so that no information is lost. If lab archives were offered by the university then I would definitely put the effort in to get things set up and it would save a lot of time in the future.
- I compared scinote vs LabArchive and LabArchive is much more intuitive and have more options and it’s very easy to navigate between the projects or follow someone else’s experiments.
- After the OSF one everything seems closed and not transparency/open science-oriented
- I was initially very enthused about the ELN trial, since I absolutely agree that laboratory documentation needs to move to an electronic form and that paper lab journals offer limited flexibility to organize multiple projects and/or experiments. I therefore appreciate the ELN trial bit am left rather disappointed after I tried it. I used LabArchives because (if I remember correctly) it was one of the two ELNs, which actually came with a smartphone and tablet app. I consider this absolutely critical for wet-lab work, since I can use my phone or tablet to record data quickly while being physically in the lab without using my computer. However, taking pictures from my smartphone and making notes does not work since LabArchive does not support image files. In general, the mobile app is very poorly designed. As a general comment, I think the most powerful tool to organize my research is still Dropbox, which allows me to save any kind of file format, allows for sharing an collaborative work, allows syncing offline generated offline, and has decent mobile apps to browse my content and to generate any kind of content from my phone or tablet. I think an ELN, which would appeal to a wide range of researchers should cover all this. But none of the four proposed ELNs does this so right now I don’t consider an ELN a help for my day-to-day work.
- Ultimately, LabArchives uses a fairly conventional hierarchical arrangement of folders and pages, with each page containing entries which can then be marked with tags. This allows you to arrange a lab book in many different ways. However, it does feel like the designers have a specific structure in mind but never explicitly explain it. My first instinct was to have a page per month, with an entry per day, but it quickly became clear that the system was not designed for this as pages became unwieldy, and linking to specific entries is not very practical. Instead I switched to having a page per day, which I quite like, but I still feel like the designer intends a more project-based approach, with folders and pages based around experiments and data rather than maintaining a record of day-to-day work. The system supports either of these perfectly well, but it would be nice if they had an intro suggesting optimal ways of using the notebook to get the most out of it. There are several small frustrations using LabArchives that come primarily from pushing it to the boundaries of what it can do. The fact that it supports html markup makes the text editor very powerful and, as a result, I used this as my main input into the lab book. However, as someone who knows a bit about coding, I found it frustrating that many important aspects such as headers, stylesheets and input tags get stripped from the page, presumably to prevent them from interfering with the main website. However, Widgets allow a lot more flexibility, and I found myself beginning to use these for more complex entries. Together these are powerful tools that give LabArchives a lot of flexibility to be used for many different purposes.
RSPACE

- To use the system effectively, I would need to carry around a laptop to my various work areas. I currently do not have one of these in the lab.
- Does it have a mobile app? This would be a very useful feature
- I am not sure how to rate RSpace without having tried any other ELN. Would certainly use it if offered. Positive feedback from one member of my group who used it.
- Steep Learning curve, complex and unintuitive interface. Cant see my group using it without a lot of nagging.
- Although it seemed easy and user friendly, it makes me sceptical. For my research and the type of data I process, it doesn’t make my life easy and it’s the only one that took me a bit longer to get the hang of data importing and uploading, even though on the other hand it has a lot of wonderful options even for open data and I can link to many accounts, hence the only high mark with the integration with other cloud and software services. For me it looks more business-y and not as helpful with data management as the other ones.
- This was a superb piece of software. So many of us are used to lab books and this (as with the other software Labarchives) allowed me to write exactly like I would in a book. Importing experiments and pointing to their locations was easy.

SCINOTE

- I enjoyed using SciNote a lot, but the complexity of the workflow will be offputting for many users. RSpace was far more approachable in this regard. Unfortunately, SciNote felt a lot like an unfinished product, and I felt like I was beta testing a lot - worth waiting a couple of years for updated versions
- No- but overall I have tested 3 products. Whilst SciNote and R-space have potential, I believe that Microsoft one not still offers the best solution to an ELN. It is to use, intergrates well with other software package, you can manipulate images and text very easily and can share between users. The only downpoint I see with one note is the time stamping of documents and that pages can be deleted without notice. R-space and Sci-note can circumvent this, which is beneficial. However, both packages need to have some desktop app that would allow users to sync to cloud-based service.
- I think for this to work properly each person and lab would need to have access to plenty of cloud storage- especially if dealing with high throughput sequencing or microscopy imaging data. A lab of 10-12 people may need 100 TB of storage per year.
- Some nice features including repositories facility and tracking of samples, but it was a bit to awkward to use for the basics and didn’t really suit our workflow, so I switched to using LabArchives for the remainder of the trial period. They are working on updates so it might be useful to re-test once these are released.
- Please don’t make us use it!
- I would prefer LabArchive. The scinote has a colourful interface but the functionality is not as good as LabArchive.
- I first had a look at all four choices, eliminated OSF straightaway as I found it not intuitive. I liked Labarchives and RSpace. My PI liked the workflow in sciNote, and I liked the fact that it is open source and written in Ruby on Rails. My PI had a go at sciNote, but did not have time to look at LabArchives. She might though in the near future and should be able to give you her opinion.
- The ability to track samples is one of it’s strongest features, especially if the sample is used by multiple collaborators. Once the workflows and protocols are set up, it will be great for using with students and other short term members of the group as they can just point and click to record experiments. It lacks a degree of flexibility to add our own pages for notes or non-experiment records.
OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK

- OSF seems very good as a repository for data with a comprehensive wiki attached. For general notetaking on an ongoing project though, the wiki isn't flexible enough.

- Whilst I can see the benefit of OSF as a platform for sharing large dataset this software is not particularly useful for bench scientist on a day-day practical use. Not for me.

- I really liked that I was able to link my orcid from the very beginning. The registration and fork options were extremely helpful. All in all, it was really great that it offers sharing options and a lot of opportunities to make work that I want public. For me it is the ideal option for an ELN

- One of the major problems with building electronic substitutions for paper is that half of the time it's built by people who've never used a paper equivalent. This seems like one of these cases. Ok, I admit that I didn't use the tutorial, but I went in blind with every one of the eLabnotebook trials to test how easy it is to pick up (as a paper lab book is) and how intuitive it is. This isn't intuitive which means that people will lose patience with it sooner rather than later and start using paper again. Most experimentalists like the following: Date, aim/hypothesis/background, experimental setup, results, conclusions. It needs to be this easy to start with. That's all you need. Fancy ways of sorting and organising files can come later based on keywords you type into experiments, but as long as the above contents are accessible, the rest will follow. I then looked at the tutorial video, and once explained, it is a little easier to get through. However, the point I was making still holds: the way this is organised is not how most scientists write in their notebooks, which will present a major obstacle for people shifting to this sort of system.