

Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations (ADHO)

Evaluation Criteria

for Submissions to the Digital Humanities Conference

(October 2023)

Preamble

The objective of the following evaluation criteria for submissions to the Digital Humanities Conference is to support a productive, constructive and fair review process. Specifically, the criteria are designed to prompt constructive rather than only negative comments; to ensure that the text of each review substantiates the number of points given and to encourage a match between the review text and the points given, for each review criterion; to ensure that reviews have a meaningful length; to help reviewers build a shared understanding of the meaning of the points; and to broaden the diversity of perspectives present at the conference.

The criteria were revised over the course of several months in 2023, in a series of consultations first within the relevant ADHO committees, including the DH2024 PC chairs, and then with the digital humanities community at large via a survey. They have been approved by the ADHO Constituent Organization Board.

Evaluation Criteria

[1, 20%] Does the submission include a sufficient description of the current state of knowledge and best practices in the area(s) relevant to the work, and is that description backed up by useful references?

- 10 – Yes, very much. There are barely any flaws and/or omissions.
- 8 – Yes, it does. There are only marginal flaws and/or omissions.
- 6 – It does to some extent. There are several flaws and/or omissions.
- 3 – No, not really. There are major flaws and/or omissions.
- 0 – No, not at all. There is hardly any information about the state of knowledge or best practices.

Please describe in what respect the submission does or does not include a sufficient discussion and useful references. Which topics or perspectives should be covered better, and/or which specific references should be added, to improve the submission in this respect? (Write at least 20 words.)

[2a, 20%] Does the work described in the submission go beyond the current state of knowledge and best practices in the areas(s) relevant to the work? This may concern method, approach, application domain, or findings.

- 10 – Yes, very much. It makes a big advance beyond the current state of knowledge and relevant best practices.
- 8 – Yes, it does. It makes a moderate advance beyond current state of knowledge and relevant best practices to some extent.
- 6 – It does to some extent. It makes a small advance beyond the current state of knowledge and relevant best practices.
- 3 – No, not really. But it is close to the current state of knowledge and relevant best practices.
- 0 – No, not at all. It ignores the current state of knowledge and relevant best practices.

Please describe in what relationship the submission stands to the current state of knowledge and best practices. How could this work go further in this respect? (Write at least 20 words.)

[2b, 20%, workshops] Does the submission describe the contents of the workshop (topics, issues, methods, tools) in sufficient detail for readers to understand what will be taught?

- 10 – Yes, very much. No or almost no relevant information is missing.
- 8 – Yes, it does. Only minor pieces of information are missing.
- 6 – It does to some extent. A few significant pieces of information are missing.
- 3 – No, not really. Several important pieces of information are missing.
- 0 – No, not at all. There is hardly any information about the contents.

Please describe which aspects of the contents would benefit from inclusion of additional detail to help readers better understand them. (Write at least 20 words.)

[3a, 20%] Does the submission describe its approach or method with sufficient detail for readers to understand what was done and why it was done, within the limitations of the abstract format?

- 10 – Yes, very much. No or almost no relevant information is missing.
- 8 – Yes, it does. Only minor pieces of information are missing.
- 6 – It does to some extent. A few significant pieces of information are missing.
- 3 – No, not really. Several important pieces of information are missing.
- 0 – No, not at all. There is hardly any information about the approach or method.

Please describe which aspects of the approach or method would benefit from inclusion of additional detail to help readers better understand them. (Write at least 20 words.)

[3b, 20%, workshops] Does the submission describe its didactical approach, the materials to be used, and the progression of topics over the course of the workshop with sufficient detail for readers to understand how the workshop will be taught?

- 10 – Yes, very much. All relevant information on these aspects is there.
- 8 – Yes, it does. Almost all relevant information is there.
- 6 – It does to some extent. Only minor pieces of information are missing.
- 3 – No, not really. Several important pieces of information are missing.
- 0 – No, not at all. There is hardly any information about these aspects.

Please describe which aspects of the approach, materials or progression would benefit from inclusion of additional detail to help readers better understand them. (Write at least 20 words.)

[4, 15%] Does the submission support diversity, in the sense that it describes work that increases the range of topics, approaches and perspectives presented at the DH conference, and/or does it give adequate recognition to a broad range of relevant scholarly work, including by members of disadvantaged or under-represented groups?

- 10 – Yes, very much. It strongly supports diversity in multiple ways.
- 8 – Yes, it does. It clearly supports some aspects of diversity.
- 6 – It does to some extent. It supports diversity, but in a limited way.
- 3 – No, not really. It does not succeed in supporting diversity.
- 0 – No, not at all. This submission does not contribute to diversity.

Please explain which aspect(s) of the submission do or do not support diversity in the sense described above. How could the submission be improved in this respect? (Write at least 20 words.)

[5, 15%] Is the submission well-structured and clearly written in a way that supports readers in understanding the submission?

- 10 – Yes, very much. Both structure and language are clear and comprehensible.
- 8 – Yes, it does. There are only minor flaws in structure and/or language.
- 6 – It does to some extent. There are several flaws in structure and/or language.
- 3 – No, not really. There are major flaws in structure and/or language.
- 0 – No, not at all. The structure and/or language are barely clear or comprehensible.

Please describe which aspects of the submission's structure or language, specifically, might benefit from reworking to improve comprehension. (Write at least 10 words.)

[6, 10%] Overall recommendation. Based on the evaluation criteria overall, but also taking into account any additional criteria or issues you may consider important for the evaluation, do you recommend that this submission be accepted for presentation or not?

- 10 – Yes, I strongly recommend that this submission be accepted.
- 8 – Yes, I recommend that this submission be accepted.
- 6 – Borderline. I have no strong position on acceptance or rejection.
- 3 – No, I would rather recommend that this submission be rejected.
- 0 – No, I would strongly recommend that this submission be rejected.

Please state what additional criteria or issues, if any, affect your overall recommendation of the submission, and why they do so in a positive or negative way (optional comment):

Reviewer confidence 1: How familiar are you with the topic and methods of the submission?

- 10 – Very familiar. I am an expert in all relevant aspects of the submission.
- 8 – Quite familiar. I am well-informed about most aspects of the submission.
- 6 – To some extent. I am informed about several aspects of the submission.
- 3 – Not really familiar. I am only aware of some aspects of the submission.
- 0 – Not familiar at all. I have not previously heard of most aspects of the submission.

Optional comment:

Reviewer confidence 2: How familiar are you with the annual Digital Humanities Conference offered by ADHO?

- 10 – Very familiar. I have been a speaker and/or reviewer several times.
- 8 – Quite familiar. I have been a speaker and/or reviewer once.
- 6 – To some extent. I have been an attendee several times.
- 3 – Not really familiar. I have been an attendee once.
- 0 – Not familiar at all. I have not been an attendee so far.

Optional comment: