

preprint review

Madry Scott, Jansen Gregory, Murray Seth, Jones, Elizabeth, Willcoxon Lia, Alhashem, Ebtehal
A Focus on the Future of our Tiny Piece of the Past: Digital Archiving of a Long-term Multi-participant Regional Project

The paper presents an ongoing project - an initiative for long-term digital storage of the results of forty-five years of interdisciplinary research. This effort has not yet been brought to a conclusion. However, the description of this valuable initiative seems to me a precious testimony and a warning to all those involved in science.

The manuscript is well written. At this stage of the project's development, no shortcomings in the research design, analysis or interpretation of the results are discernible.

Title

The title clearly reflects the content of the article.

Abstract

The abstract is concise and presents the main findings of the study.

Introduction

The introduction clearly explains the motivation for the study.

The research question and objectives are clearly presented.

The introduction builds on relevant research performed in the field (discussion within the archaeology community and the Computer Applications in Archaeology community).

Materials and methods

Details for the methods and analysis are provided.

More detailed information on the problems encountered and the resulting decisions on the methods planned to complete the metadata, provenance or missing keywords (if the project has reached this stage) would be welcome. These methods/procedures could then be reproduced by other researchers.

For example:

- Were certain data deliberately and consciously eliminated from the group of archived documents? If so, what were the principles and reasons for this selection?
- Is it planned to distinguish between metadata, paradata and ... currently existing in the documents in question from those that are reconstructed or deduced?
- Will the information about who is completing the data be retained?
- Is the documentation that has been destroyed or not made available in any way qualifiable - quantitatively or qualitatively? (quantity, type of data, their subject, ...) ? An estimation of the 'percentage' of lost data in relation to that which could be saved could be extremely informative.

Results

It is too early to evaluate the final results.

Tables and figures

All Figures are understandable without reference to the main body of the article.

Figures 1, 2 and 3 contain text which, in its current form, is not legible at 1:1 scale and needs to be enlarged (making it illegible in print). It would be very useful to be able to partially improve their legibility.

Discussion

The conclusions and cautionary statements made are adequately and clearly supported by the facts.

References

All references cited in the text appear in the list of references. The reverse is not true.

- a) Aczel B, Szaszi B, Holcombe AO (2021)
- b) Copiello S (2020)
- c) Doyle H, Gass A, Kennison R (2004)

The reference **a)** concerns peer reviewing, b) focuses on issues of the transition to a open access publishing landscape and analyses them from the perspective of Elsevier - a major commercial publisher, and reference c) is about the costs of open access publishing.

If the authors intend to cite them in the context of this article, the thematic link should be clearly indicated.