

Dear editors,
thank you for the reviews, which we have considered carefully. Below you will find our comments (marked in blue) on the objections made, as well as references to changes we made in the paper itself. The reviews certainly have helped to identify somewhat blurry parts of the text. We hope its revised version will be accepted to the volume.

(Frederic, Katja, Wenke, Kerstin)

Review:

Recommendation's Summary

Dear authors,

many thanks for going along with our PCI-based review and revision process. As you will see from the reviewers' comments, your chapter is considered a valuable contribution, packed with useful observations and insights. One of the reviewers is overall very positive indeed, although he also calls for a more critical and broader contextualisation of the results.

The other reviewer somewhat more critical, also highlighting some more technical issues as well as the at times unnecessarily opaque language. What also stands out is that perhaps the whole text could be re-framed not as a workshop report but a contribution that only refers to the workshop in passing but focusses more on the actual results and insights? If the workshop framing is retained, please consider outlining the rationale, aim, etc. of that meeting in more detail (although I would strongly recommend you to tone down the workshop component).

We have reworded the title, because it led to misunderstandings.

Overall, this is a really interesting and strong chapter that will fit beautifully into the volume - thank you for your submission; I look forward to seeing your revised version in due time.

(Riede, Plutniak, Hussain)

Review 1:

The manuscript is well written, clear, and comprehensive. The paper describes a project still in development and discussion. To my knowledge, there are no flaws in the analysis or the design of the research. There are also no ethic concerns with this paper. The only thing missing is a more detailed discussion at the end.

Title/abstract/introduction

The title clearly reflects the content of the article. Although the abstract offers a good overview of the article, it does not provide the findings itself.

We have added to the abstract

The motivation for the study is clearly indicated in the introduction and based on the need to link so-called thing-editions, meaning lists of archaeological objects recorded in a normed data format, to open data repositories or databases. Based on two practical examples, the authors want to present the concept of digital transformation in this study. The research question here lies in understanding how two different concepts of order are functioning as part of circulating references. The study is done with the distinct goal of integrating these thing-editions in an already existing framework of the German Archaeological Institute (iDAI.world).

Materials and Methods

As methods, the authors rely on Brunu Latours terms of “inscription”, which describes fixed results in research processes and “circulating references”, which describes the process of knowledge making due to the research process and how these developments (called “trade-offs”) are forming what is considered the state of the art. The chapter on Latours theories is well written and understandable but could use one concrete example for illustration.

After that, the materials are described, which consist of the Corpus of Roman Finds in European Barbaricum (CRFB) on the one side and the Conspectus Formarum Terrae Sigillatae Modo Confectae (Conspectus) on the other. The first data set (CRBF) is focusing on the dating of the objects, which oftentimes are not exactly described. As certain types are indicating certain chronological dates, others are vaguer and can only refer the dating frames. By utilizing a typochnological module, the authors present how dating in even vaguely described objects can be done. This part is very well written and understandable. The second example (Conspectus) is focusing on the form of the object and the integration of a well-established form catalogue into the iDAI.Objects database. The collection of Terra Sigillata types provided by Ettliger can therefore be integrated into the databases of iDAI.Objects as well as iDAI.world. This part, although shorter, is written well, but I would have wished for some more paragraphs on the integration of Ettliger's system into iDAI.Objects and ultimately into iDAI.world.

A very innovative idea is the Archaeological Form Slider with which the authors want to create a gaming component to the database, with which researchers could build their own Terra Sigillata profiles to see if they discovered a new form or an existing one. Another approach described is the Relation Diagram, which as well is a nice implementation for the data in the database. Both ideas are still in development, but well described.

Results & Discussion

Instead of Results and Discussion, the authors offer a Synthesis in which they summarize the application of Latours terms and the compensations for his trade-offs in archaeological data. This chapter falls too short as it does not include any further discussion of the results or problematizes other categories (except dating or form) not covered in this article.

We have added some perspectives

One could for example discuss the value of that classification system for the future in more detail. How should it be developed further? In which ways could Machine Learning contribute?

References, Tables & Figures

The references are well made and comprehensive. To my understanding, the amount of citations within the paper is appropriate. The figures were well chosen and well described. The tables were understandable as well.

(Sebastian Hageneuer)

Review 2:

From paper to byte: A workshop report on the digital transformation of two things editions

The paper focuses on the considerations involved in the creation of archaeological reference manuals in general and their digitalisation in particular. The challenges of the digitizing process are illustrated on two major reference collections, the Corpus of Roman finds in the Barbaricum (CFRB) and the Conspectus Formarum Terrae Sigillatae Modo Confectae (Conspectus). The translation of a resource from analogue to digital format forces the authors to re-evaluate how 'types' and 'classifications' are created in catalogs and what effect they have on the standardization of archaeological practice and discourse. To address these issues, authors effectively utilize the theoretical framework of Latour (2002), using his 'inscription' and 'circulating

reference' to refer to each thing or ideal type that becomes a scientific entity through its catalog description. Such type both expands and limits the possibilities of researchers, in amplifying compatibility, standardization and calculation on one hand and reducing the objects particularity, variety and locality on the other. Authors zoom in on the digitalisation of the varied chrono-types and artifact forms, the two main ordering concepts in the CFRB and Conspectus resources. Both these concepts are implemented through group-based taxonomies, where the variants and core type maintain functional but malleable dependency. As each variant needs to be digitized, and broken out of its defining frame, the delineation of these taxonomies is called for re-evaluation, the omissions are rendered explicit and visible, and solutions are devised for information that is the property of the group rather than individual artefacts.

While this paper discusses classifications pertinent to researchers studying the material culture of Roman Limes, the issues raised with regard to creation of digital standards are relevant for all historical digital archives as they are generalized/globally applicable.

The sections on the chrono-types and artefact form taxonomies were clear for someone who deals with this material culture and digital archives, but will be hard to read by a novice to these topics.

However, since this is to appear in an anthology that deals with the very topic, we do not consider this problematic.

I particularly enjoyed the final section on the FormSlider and relation diagram, interactive tools that can verify and validate type definitions. Such tools fulfill the promise of the digital medium.

The manuscript is fairly densely written and could use more active voice, less vagueness and more consistency in spelling key words, such as Roman Era (the term Roman appears throughout the article with both upper and lower case, which is simply disturbing).

We have systematically standardised the key words.

The rationale is clear in the introduction, however it is hard to follow up in the rest of the paper, which focuses on the description of the structure of the analogue resources and their digital handling:

- Authors entitled the manuscript to be a report on the results of a workshop, but workshop agenda, aims and participants remain unspecified, and thus the stakeholders and adopters/users of the new digital resources remain muted and devoid of agency.

This is a linguistic misunderstanding: This is an interim report of a project which is still ongoing. Hopefully we have now been able to clear this up by using the wording "interim report" in the title.

- When opening the paper, the authors declare that they are "not concerned with the making or publishing process but with the possibilities and limitations of working with aggregate information in the context of catalogues " (3-4).

We are solely providing data and are not concerned with its analyses. We have added this in the introduction.

Yet there are no examples of aggregate analysis of the catalog data in the paper, not even as putative scenarios or use cases. A lot of attention paid to the translation of the various typonchronological modules and artefact forms into a digital format, which seems perfectly legitimate and the authors might want to say include in the introduction.

The article utilizes a lot of 10-dollar and abstract terms where simpler ones might be substituted.

Presumably, this refers to the technical terms of science & technology studies and actor-network theory. We ask that the terms be retained as they are, since they are technical terms, similar to the technical terms requested by the reviewer in the discussion field of digitalisation.

Some of the figures (4, 5, 6 are small and bordering on non-legible A native speaker editor with a focus on consistency and readability is recommended.

Can we please clarify this together with the editorial team?

Occasionally the text suffers from vagueness and sometimes leaves the reader hanging entirely :

"Thus, in CRFB, the specific bead, casserole, and fibula found in graves [...] are not merely grave gifts for a deceased anymore. " (p.12) I have read this sentence several times and still wonder what the authors intended. Shared implicit knowledge is expected from the reader, who would rather hear what the bead, casserole and fibula have become from the authors, rather than wonder herself.

We have modified the sentence and hope that it is now understandable. Here we ask for a short feedback. If necessary, we can do without the statement and delete the sentence.

The overall aim of exploring how digitalisation impacts the work with aggregate information in the catalogues could be addressed more thoroughly:

- The authors seem silent or equivocal on the impact of digitalization. While they consider digitisation important, they do not differentiate between 1.0 and 2.0 approaches, and fail to address the impact of different digital solutions to the specific problems of typonchronological module or artifact form taxonomies.

We certainly are working for web the 2.0 environment. We think that addressing web 1.0 would be outmoded. But nevertheless we made that clear in the short chapter on perspectives and therefor hope to help the reader.

- Authors support LOUD data creation, mostly so that the data can be connected to other DAI digital collections, but again the concern for the usability of the result is missing. How many of the user community can effectively query LOUD data and how usability guaranteed?

See chapter “perspectives”.

- The authors problematize the missing and vague dating intervals in the CRFB, yet rarely specify the limitations this actually imposes on aggregate research. Do researchers avoid such records? Does the search algorithm leave them out? Do machines and people actively discard broadly dated records? We learn little about the particular failure mode the authors fear with the digital medium. The authors also seem unaware of the numerous tools that have been designed to deal with chronologically broad or uncertain data (e.g chronolog, tempun in Python just to mention a few).

The mentioned tools are very helpful for analysing big chunks of data, but are not relevant for the conversion of the analogue examples we are working on, into a digital database. Especially ‘tempun’ is focussed on data analysis using Monte-Carlo-type approaches. This will certainly come in handy, when our data is available to be further processed and worked with and we will refer to such tools, to allow statistical exploration of the temporal aspects of our data. The dating-ranges (Datierungsrahmen) and the implied uncertainty in the context of typology on the other hand can not be mitigated by those tools as they are the agreed upon post and ante quem for a certain type.

-Likewise the group structure of forms in the Conspectus is described, but no actual comparison of the digital vs analogue resource usage of the shape taxonomy is presented, thus leaving the reader wondering about the actual impact of digitisation and missing the mark of being able to gauge the limitations and possibilities with reference to analogue resource.

The way analogue resources are transformed into digital format matters. Each tool has its affordances which is a reason why many digitization projects take stock from user groups as to what their research goals are so as to minimize the constraints imposed by the new medium, and to take advantage of the new affordances inherited from it. Authors fail to discuss such a process, which leaves the article and digitisation process without a frame of reference that could serve as a clear measure against which the final outcome can be evaluated. Authors also miss a chance here to explore which catalogues hold more authority with the users: analogue or digital ones?

One particularly striking omission was the lack of connection to other digitisation /standardisation initiatives in other EU or US where initiatives (DINAA, tDAR, Getty Museum) too are engaged in the digitisation of cultural heritage collections and their systematisation through reference manuals.

We are transforming a well recognized catalogue, which has its system. We are not dealing with other systematisations of which we are certainly aware. But that is not the topic of the paper.

(Adèla Sobotkova)
