

## Reviewer guidelines

### Information about the peer review process

Each submission will be reviewed by at least two reviewers selected among the Programme Committee (PC), the DARIAH bodies (DARIAH Joint Research Committee, DARIAH Coordination Office, DARIAH Strategic Management Team, Scientific Board) and other experts. The reviewers are chosen by the PC according to their expertise in the digital arts and humanities.

The proposals will be reviewed against the following criteria (presented in order of relevance).

1. Relevance to the event's topic (25%)
2. Relevance to the DARIAH's community and DARIAH's strategy (25%)
3. Originality, innovation (25%)
4. Structure and clarity (25%)

The Programme Committee reserves the right to reassign a review if the two reviewers do not reach consensus within discussion in the consensus meeting. Reviewers share their expert evaluation on the proposals but the final decision of acceptance, rejection or change of format (for instance, suggestion to present a paper submission in the form of a poster) will be made by the Programme Committee.

We highly encourage you to claim credit for it and sign your review. This is of course only an option, we fully understand if you prefer to remain anonymous, and your review will be equally helpful. After submission, as usual, review reports will be shared with the authors and additional comments with the PC (via the ConfTool features), but otherwise will be kept confidential.

Upon consent and after the reviewing period, the pool of reviewers will be listed on the conference website to acknowledge their work. (Please note that listing the reviewers will under no circumstances allow for identification of which submission had been reviewed by whom.)

### Peer review guidelines

The role of reviewers is vital in **keeping the scholarly standards of the conference high**. We are incredibly **grateful** to our reviewers for:

1. **Assessing** the submissions based on their scholarly merits, soundness, integrity and relevance to the conference.
2. **Contributing to the development** of the submissions by sharing their remarks, and maintaining a **constructive** tone, even if there is a lot to criticise about the paper in question, and suggesting **as concrete as possible** additions or modifications.

Apart from making decisions about the submissions **based on our agreed evaluation criteria** (see above), we also recommend **reading them against the [description of the submission types](#)** and checking their alignment.

By keeping an awareness of your possible cultural, disciplinary etc. biases, implicit or explicit, you can avoid having them negatively affect your judgements. We encourage firm, detailed but also encouraging reviews. Reviewing is part of scholarly communication and should be critical but fair.

The present reviewing guidelines are aligned with that of the [Digital Humanities 2022 conference](#) and we strongly endorse their [ten tips for conference reviewing](#).