

Some comments on the review form that I found difficult to use as a basis to review the publication

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for considering to undertake a peer review for the Bridging Humanities journal (www.bridginghumanities.nl). The nature of the journal implies a peer review process in which aspects other than those known in traditional academic peer review processes to be taken into account.

The aim of the journal is to experiment with new forms of academic knowledge production in the digital age within the scope of *qualitative narrative research*. We do this by publishing *digitalmultimedia* projects that are carried out in *co-creation* with other knowledge producers outside the academic domain, such as artists or journalists. In the publications we connect the field Humanities to other academic and non-academic fields. This translates into new forms of publications in which the specific structure and design are seen as part of the content. The publications (for an example see the first published article [Croquemort](#)) are non-linear and visual designed web projects that are not primarily text based and that include interactive features that facilitate user experience. As a peer reviewer you are asked to take these aspects into account, and to view the originality of the project also in these terms.

Bridging Humanities projects are carried out in co-creation, and a reflection on this process should form an integral part of the publication. Research in co-creation implies a non-linear process, in which various knowledge sources next to cognitive knowledge (such as affective or embodied knowledge) are valued on equal terms. Research in co-creation is a creative enterprise with human experience at its core.

Projects should address new possibilities offered by digitalisation in doing science and reaching the public. This implies methodological developments in making use and producing new digital data but it can also touch upon epistemological questions (e.g. how people adopt **digital technologies** and which new hierarchies in knowledge sharing and production present themselves). We would see greater transparency of research processes and data archives as a necessity. Bridging Humanities offers not only a place for storing raw material but moreover for providing insight in how the research is build up from these data and earlier publications.

Bridging Humanities does not adhere to a maximum word count for its publications. Yet, while narrative text is an effective way for communicating ideas, we promote multimedia publications and want to avoid replicating print articles or monographs on the web in the form as we know it (mainly text based pdfs).

The review will follow the criteria for publication:

1. The study presents original research within the scope of the journal, i.e. qualitative narrative research that has been carried out in co-creation and makes use of digital methodologies.
2. The structure and visual design of the project support the arguments posed and allow for innovative presentation of academic knowledge production.
3. The research makes clear how it builds on previous work and [adheres to appropriate reporting guidelines and community standards for data availability](#).

4. Conclusions are presented in an appropriate fashion and are supported by a reflective analysis of the co-creation process.
5. The article is presented in an intelligible fashion that avoids jargon and is written in standard English.
6. The research meets all applicable standards for the ethics of experimentation and research integrity.

Please note that reviewers are anonymous by default. In **section A**, you are asked to provide your information. Reviewers' identities are not revealed to authors or to other reviewers unless reviewers specifically request to be identified. If a submission is accepted, we will ask you to start the discussion with a wider public about the submission with a first comment from your personal point of view, opening up for further comments, critical readings and links to other research.

In **section B** you are asked to evaluate the submission following the publication criteria mentioned above. We kindly ask you to present your review in a professional and constructive way, focussing on ways to improve the submission.

With regard to the language, Bridging Humanities publishes in English. Additional translations/languages may be chosen for certain articles. You are asked to review the main body of English text, and if possible to take into account the texts in the other languages as well. Spell-checking and copyediting is undertaken by the authors and the editorial board before submission, but if you have comments on the language use, please use section B.5 for that.

In **section C** you are asked to provide your main conclusions on the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, and your overall recommendation for publication.

Lastly, in **section D** you may share with us any confidential notes on the article, which you would prefer the author not to see. Also, we would appreciate if you could give us feedback on the set-up of the journal and the peer review process.

A. Details Reviewer

1. Name and affiliation reviewer

Stefania scagliola

2. Title of the submission under review

Dissenting Voices: Challenging the colonial system

3. Please fill in the **return date**, which should be within the time frame set by the editor.

4. Would you like your **identity** to be revealed to the authors?

No problem

5. Please state any **relationship(s)/possible conflict of interest** you have with the authors and cocreators.

6. Please indicate which **area(s) of expertise** is/are relevant to this review and how confident you are in the respective area.

Digital humanities, enhanced publications, multimodal publications, digital history, source criticism

Lijst

1. Please provide your **recommendation** on whether you think the submission should be considered for publication

- A. The submission should be rejected.
- B. The submission should be rejected in its current state.*
- C. The submission should be accepted after some reworking.....
- D. The submission should be accepted. But should be used as a test case on how to improve the format for next contributions,

B. Message to the Editorial Board

1. If you have any confidential message to the editorial board on the **content of the submission**, please provide it here.

2. We would appreciate **feedback on the procedure**. Please indicate how you experience writing a review for Bridging Humanities and how we can improve our review process.

Some more comments on the publication:

- I miss an explanation about the film essay
- If I am correct the new approach has multiple dimensions:
 - Not only text, but multimodal
 - Narrative qualitative
 - CO-creation with adoption of non academic conventions
 - However, I miss a reflection on what is perceived as the added value of the song and of the film, in the first case it is an individual interpretation, in the second it seems the filmer has facilitated the project, but there is no trace of his specific interpretation of the topic.
 - The reflection is present in the website of the journal, but not in the content of the specific project.
 - It is taken for granted that it is an enrichment of the project, and it is indeed a very beautiful and appealing song, but if reviewed with academic standards, the rigor of logic requires to be explicit about its value in terms of knowledge production, is this the same as artistic expression?
 - Arts used to be part and parcel of Academic Science, what has changed and is it coming back because of the digital?
- Annelot Hoek does deal with the distinction between research journalism and historical research, but to be honest, I don't see much difference in the way she discusses her topic and Maartje Janse does, they have re-used material that they have used for a different project, instead of lengthy texts with notes, they are turned into more concise essays, with a clear relationship: critics of the colonial system, they have added reflections on the broader theme of dominant and smaller narratives in history and memory of colonization, they have included images and interviews, they have asked a musician to compose a song and a filmer to present a film essay,
- The key question would be then: how is knowledge about dissenting colonial voices perceived and consumed differently?
- My impression is that this is a very hard question to answer, and that a workshop should be organized after conducting a small user study under different audiences: students, lecturers familiar with the subject, artists, academics not familiar with the topic, information architecture designers, web designers, graphic designers,

A possible solution to the magnitude of perspectives and insights that are presented could be the following:

- in general other alternative platforms explore with similar alternatives and solve the problem of too much text and too much content by making use of visualisations and boxes, and very concise texts. I think that this might be helpful to solve the problem of getting lost, and only understanding the relation between the texts after reading them all. This is something that a reviewer does, but I doubt whether a general reader will make that effort. How about visualizing a pathway that can be followed?

Some comments on the website:

- I found it difficult to browse from the journal website to the specific part of the website devoted to the 'dissenting colonial voices' and back,
- The new form should offer some kind of recognizable format, the variation between the contributions is quite confusing, if you introduce something new, it should be presented in a recognizable clear way, I was fascinated, but lost, could not get an idea of where to start and where to begin.