

Reviewer guidelines

The guidelines below are in strong alignment with open peer review policies and recommendations of the [ADHO Digital Humanities](#) and the [Digital Humanities im deutschsprachigen Raum](#) conferences. These guidelines have been updated for the 2024 DARIAH Annual Event.

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 in the DARIAH network. The reviewers are chosen by the PC according to their expertise in the digital arts, humanities, cultural heritage and related fields.

The proposals will be reviewed against the following criteria:

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

The Programme Committee reserves the right to reassign a review if the two reviewers do not reach consensus. 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.

Open Peer Review Policy

Following and building on positive experiences with open peer review practices implemented in the ADHO Digital Humanities and other regional Digital Humanities conferences, the Programme Committee will organise the peer review process for the DARIAH Annual Event 2024 using **open identities**. This means that the identities of the submitting authors and of the reviewers will be reciprocally revealed to each other and to the Programme Committee but will not be publicly shared. **The review reports will be shared with the authors and the PC** (via the ConfTool features), **but otherwise kept confidential**.

Bias criteria for declining review¹

Please check the following list of bias criteria thoroughly before accepting any review as well as when conducting a review. Criteria A to C should lead to declining a review. In the case of criteria D to F, you as the reviewer should make a decision on a case-by-case basis.

This list does not cover all possible scenarios in which bias may play a role. Each reviewer is encouraged to thoroughly and conscientiously reflect upon their own biases regarding a given submission and, when in doubt, decline to review.

Exclusion criteria

A. Close relationships: first-degree relationships such as close family, marriage, civil partnership, romantic partnership, etc.

B. Existing or planned collaboration: current or planned close scientific collaboration, e.g. joint publications, a joint project implementation.

C. Existing, imminent, or recent professional hierarchical relationship: official subordination or a supervisory relationship up to three years after termination of the relationship, as well as imminent or planned official dependence or supervisory relationship (from a teacher-student relationship up to and including the postdoc phase).

Case-by-case decision

D. Past close cooperation: significant scientific cooperation within the last 1.5 years, e.g. joint publications or joint project realisations.

E. Competition: preparation of a proposal or implementation of a project on a closely related research topic.

F. Distant kinship or other close personal relationship: kinship relationships that do not fall under A), other personal ties or conflicts.

The Programme Committee will do their best to avoid possible conflicts of interest. Still, in case you as a reviewer become aware of a conflict of interest or if you have any objections to openly revealing your reviewer identity, **we urge you to indicate any such issues by using the 'Comments to the Programme Committee' field in Conftool.**

¹ Adapted from the ADHO Digital Humanities Conference Reviewing Guidelines and Recommendations (https://dh2023.adho.org/?page_id=471)

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. Review decisions should not be affected by the origins of the manuscript, including the nationality, ethnicity, political beliefs, race, gender, sexual orientation, or religion of the authors.
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 concretely 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** in the Call for Papers and checking their alignment.

We recommend first ruling out potential conflicts of interest or biases. In a relatively small community, full impartiality or having absolutely no collaboration history might be rare. The bias criteria listed above should help you decide whether the possible bias reaches the level of a Conflict of Interest.

By keeping an **awareness** of your possible **cultural, disciplinary and other kinds of biases**, implicit or explicit, you can **avoid having them negatively affect your judgements**.

We **encourage firm, detailed but also constructive and encouraging reviews**. Reviewing is part of scholarly communication and should be critical but fair.

We encourage our reviewers to **include full bibliographic references or DOIs/URLs** to further information that they feel would improve the quality of the submission.

In the spirit of collaboration, please do not forget that the overall aim of reviewing is to help our colleagues to improve the quality of their submitted works, rather than express one's professional or personal interests.