**Digital Memory Dialogues – Peer-Review Form**

Peer-reviewers are asked **not to judge** the responses in terms of the extent to which they agree with them (this can be debated in the live discussion).

They are also **not asked to focus** on spelling, punctuation and grammar, unless so problematic that it affects understanding.

We **do not ask peer-reviewers** to offer granular feedback via sentence-by-sentence review comments, rather they should complete the Peer-Review feedback form below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the Response – does it provide a one sentence response (without the words ‘yes’ or ‘no’) to one or more of the question outlined in the provocation |  |
| Does it offer an adequate response to the provocation?*We judge ‘adequacy’ in terms of how accurate/ nuanced/ rigorous/ complete the response seems to be.* | Yes/ No |
| Does the position of the Response clearly relate to the Contributor’s expertise (as outlined in their bio)? | Yes/No |
| What ‘new knowledge’ do you think is provided by the Response?  |  |
| Are there any elements of the Response that the Contributor could better explain, given the journal’s interdisciplinary and cross-sector readership? *E.g., does it use a particular methodology that others may not be familiar with, does it use acronyms which need to be spelt out on first turn, does it assume knowledge of technologies that those outside of their field would be unfamiliar with.* |  |
| What, if any, improvements need to be made to ensure the Response is as accurate, nuanced, coherent, rigorous, and detailed as possible? *[In answering this question, it is important to consider the tone of the piece – whilst we welcome Responses that are reflections on practice or work-in-progress, they should still contextualise this within existing practice and/or theory. Other responses will be more specifically anchored within academic literature.]* |  |
| What is your recommendation for whether to publish this piece. | AcceptMinor RevisionsMajor RevisionsDo not publish |