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**Peer Reviewer’s Response**

Reviewer’s name\*: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\* Your name will not be released to the author unless you place a checkmark here: \_\_\_

Please indicate whether you would want your name to be included in a list of *NCAW* reviewers posted on the journal site. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Rate your overall response to this project**

\_\_\_\_ I strongly recommend publication.

\_\_\_\_ I recommend publication but offer some suggestions for revision.

\_\_\_\_ I recommend that the project be revised for further consideration.

\_\_\_\_ I do not recommend publication.

**Review Criteria**

1. Relationship between article and digital component

Does the author demonstrate how the production of digital tool(s) and/or feature(s) will lead to a scholarly argument’s key points (either by enhancing the depth of insight or making it possible) and/or will illustrate aspects of that argument in dynamic and interactive ways? Are all proposed aspects of the project’s digital component necessary to making the proposed interpretive claim(s)?

1. Choice of tool(s) or platform(s)

Is it clear what specific tool(s) or platform(s) are being used and why they were chosen? Is the software open source, and is it the best choice for the project? Is there a different kind of tool or platform that would make the project more successful?

1. Audience and Contextualization

Is the project designed for a scholarly audience? Could it potentially appeal to non-scholarly audiences as well? Is contextual information about the data and/or content provided for users who would like to explore the topic in more detail? Is it clear where the data and/or content is coming from, and is it clearly credited to a hosting institution and/or creator? Is it also clear how the data and/or content was collected?

1. User Experience

Is it easy to navigate the digital component of the project, and is the interface intuitive? Are any aspects of the interface confusing or complicated? Are key research questions of the project answered through navigation of the digital component? Is the relationship between the different parts of the project (text, image, etc.) clear?

1. Relation to other digital projects

What is your assessment of the proposed project's relation to similar digital art history examples or digital humanities examples produced within the liberal arts? Is the project original, and does it make an important contribution to the fields of digital art history and digital humanities more broadly?

1. Additional comments

Is there anything else the project does well? Anything that can be improved?

**Suggested revisions**

What suggestions do you have for revising the project? No matter what your opinion of the project is, the author as well as the editors of *NCAW* will be extremely grateful for any constructive criticism you can provide. We see the peer review as a productive process that helps the author to develop and improve their project.

*Please send your comments to*

DAH editor Carey Gibbons (dah\_editor@19thc-artworldwide.org)

**Thank you for your support of *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide!***