

Digital Memory Dialogues

Submission and Peer-Review Process

Stage 1.

Contributors submit their responses to the Dialogue Editor – the creator of the Provocation by the advertised deadline, following the Contributor Guidelines.

[We strongly encourage Dialogue Editors to proactively engage with Contributors at the earliest stage possible – encourage them to share initial outlines and draft notes. This will speed up the review process and minimise the risk of unsuitable contributions that need to be dismissed.]

The Editor's role is **not to judge** the responses in terms of the extent to which they agree with them, rather at this stage the Editor is asked to write a short report to the Editor-in-Chief (Prof Victoria Grace Richardson-Walden) or one of the Co-Editors (Dr Kate Marrison or Dr Ben Pelling), as assigned to your Dialogue, answering the following questions:

1. Title of Response
2. Does the Response fit the Dialogue Style Guide?
3. Does the Response offer an adequate response to the provocation?
We judge 'adequacy' in terms of how accurate/ nuanced/ rigorous/ complete the response seems to be.
4. Does the position of the Response clearly relate to the Contributor's expertise (as outlined in their bio)?
5. Initial comments on the Response [Please keep to no more than 10 sentences]
6. Is the Response suitable to pass onto the next stage of peer-review? Yes/No

At this stage, the Dialogue Editor and assigned coordinator will discuss whether the Response is appropriate to pass onto peer-review. If no, they will work together to source another Contributor. If yes, the Response progresses to the next stage.

Stage 2.

Each Contributor will Peer-Review each of the Responses, beyond their own.

Again, the Contributor is **not asked 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 provided, which asks the following questions:

1. Title of Response
2. Does the Response offer an adequate response to the Provocation? Yes/No
We judge 'adequacy' in terms of how accurate/ nuanced/ rigorous/ complete the response seems to be.
3. In no more than 5 sentences, please summarise how you consider the Response to answer the Provocation.
4. Does the position of the Response clearly relate to the Contributor's expertise (as outlined in their bio)?
5. What 'new knowledge' do you think is provided by the Response?
6. 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.*
7. 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.]
8. Overall comments on the Response [Please keep to no more than 10 sentences]
9. Is the Response suitable to pass onto the next stage of peer-review? Accept; Minor Revisions; Major Revisions

Please use the peer-review form provided.

At this stage, the Dialogue Editor will summarise the feedback from each Peer-Review with their own comment on this feedback, especially where there is conflicting advice or where they feel the feedback will move the Response off-topic.

The returned feedback should emphasise:

- **BEST FEATURES OF THE RESPONSE**
- **AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**
- **DECISION: ACCEPT; MINOR REVISIONS; MAJOR REVISIONS**

The Dialogue Editor should be open to discussing any queries with the Contributors at the final editing stage.

3.

Final Approval

Each Contributor should return a final version of their Response to the Dialogue Editor by the agreed deadline. This final version should be marked up with edits using the **Track Changes** feature in Word and should include a brief response to the provided feedback at the **end of the document**.

The final version must include a Contributor biography, and a profile photograph should be attached to the email alongside the Response.

At this stage the **Dialogue Editor** should check:

- 1) Has the Contributor responded to peer-review feedback in a satisfactory manner? *(If not, then this should be discussed with the Contributor at first, and if not resolved, then with the Journal Editor)*
- 2) Spelling, punctuation, and grammar (especially correct names for organisations and places, e.g., Does an organisation have 'The' in its title or not)
- 3) Accuracy of facts

If a final quick check is necessary with the Contributor, this should be turned around within 72 working hours.

Final versions should then be reviewed by the assigned coordinator from the core editorial team. Then Contributors and Dialogue Editor will be informed of acceptance.