

Writing and Submitting the Review

RIDE aims at providing comprehensive information and critical assessments of the reviewed projects to its readers. To that end, we require the reviewers to appreciate and make extensive use of our catalogues of criteria:

- [Criteria for Reviewing Scholarly Digital Editions](#)
- [Criteria for Reviewing Digital Text Collections](#)
- [Criteria for Tools and Environments for Digital Scholarly Editing](#)

Note that these catalogues are meant to remind the reviewer of issues that are crucial for the evaluation of digital editions and text collections but not as a mandatory list of subjects each of which has to be addressed by the reviewer.

The length of the review can vary depending on how much the resource offers that is worthy of discussion (with a minimum of 2000 words). Information regarding the formatting, bibliography, file format, etc. can be found below in the writing guidelines.

You can submit your review by email to the [Managing Editor](#) or the editors in charge of the planned issue (in case there is a dedicated [Call for Review](#)). In addition to the review itself, we require all reviewers to fill out a substantial questionnaire (opens in new window):

- [Questionnaire: Scholarly Editions](#)

- [Questionnaire: Text Collections](#)

Please choose the questionnaire according to the type of resource that you are reviewing. This can be done before or after submitting the review; however, we suggest to do so before submitting. The data entered in the questionnaire will be used for two purposes: 1) General information regarding the reviewed project as well as the reviewer will be used to generate the header of the written review; 2) the specific information regarding the reviewed project will be used to gain statistical insights into the sphere of digital editions and text collections. The written review and the questionnaire will be merged into a single XML file publicly available for download.

Writing Guidelines

Documents and Formatting

RIDE transforms submitted reviews into XML documents adhering as much as possible to the TEI standard. If possible, please submit your review as a Microsoft Word Document (doc, docx). While editing your review, please observe the following rules on formatting and editing:

1. Every review should include an abstract (one paragraph) in English. The abstract should not be an introduction to the review but rather a concise summary of its content.
2. Format the title as heading 1 (the title of your review should usually be the name of the project you are reviewing)
3. Structure the document using headings 2-3 (don't use levels below 3). Second order headings will be used to generate a ToC. If you decide against the use of headings, the review will start with the heading "Review" (e.g. <https://ride.i-d-e.de/issues/issue-1/nietzschesource/>). If you decide to use

headings, please start right at the beginning of the review with a second level-heading.

4. You may use bold, italics, underlining and strike-through.
5. You may not use colors other than black.
6. The paragraph font size may not vary.
7. The minimum length of a paragraph is two (better three) sentences.
8. Use a Unicode font.
9. Links have to be archived unless they are embedded in the text, e.g. in order to explicitly name the landing page of a project (see also section “Links” below).
10. RIDE welcomes pictures and especially screenshots of reviewed projects that help the reader to understand what the project is or is not doing (see also section “Pictures” below). Please note: Every figure should be referenced from the text!
11. Quotes are in single quotation marks: ‘Text of the quote’.
12. Mark gaps in quotes with square brackets and three dots: [...].
13. Avoid, as much as possible, the use of footnotes (footnotes will be transformed into endnotes).
14. Every Review should include a list of relevant references (see also section “Bibliographic Rules” below).
15. Footnotes, figure captions and references end with a full stop.

Pictures

Screenshots, serve a documentary function, making available to the reader the state of a certain aspect of the project under review; while editions are expected to change their appearance in the future, the review will remain stable. If you want to include pictures in your review, please number them in the order they are supposed to appear in the review and name them as follows: picture-1.png, picture-2.png, etc. We prefer pictures in the PNG format. Please

make sure that the quality of your screenshots is appropriate for online publications.

Please do not insert the pictures into your review; instead, enter a mark in the following format where you would like the picture to appear:

###picture-1*Subtitle for this picture###

!important Due to the formatting in WordPress it can happen that image and text are not always next to each other. Therefore every figure should be referenced from the text, e. g. “(see fig. 1)” or “As figure 1 shows...”.

Links

Obviously, RIDE allows links to webpages. Please provide a complete link including the protocol (http, https) and mark the beginning and end of a link with angle brackets (<>).

Instead of the ‘Accessed: Date’ information that is usually required in the bibliographic accounting of web-links, we ask reviewers to create a snapshot of each link they refer to in their text using the archive.org ‘Save a Page’-service. In order to create a snapshot, navigate to <http://archive.org/web/> and enter the link in the ‘Save a Page’ form. This will create a snapshot and refer you to the saved page. Please use the link of this saved page instead of the original link in your written review. Example:

Original link

<http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/6/2/000120/000120.html>

Snapshot link:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20140407144337/http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/6/2/000120/000120.html>

Caveat: Unfortunately, not every page is archivable using the ‘Save a Page’ service. Some server configurations are incompatible with the service and sometimes the application itself will make it impossible to refer to a specific page. Please always check whether the snapshot really contains the data you try to archive. Should you be unable to create a usable snapshot, revert to the ‘Accessed: Date’ method outlined below.

Bibliographical Rules

RIDE uses the Chicago Author-Date style. A short summary can be found [here](#). If you want to look at examples at RIDE, please use the reviews from [Issue 3](#) onwards.

Review Submission Checklist

1. Make sure your review complies with the writing guidelines above.
2. Remember to create (if possible) an archive.org snapshot of each webpage you link in your review with the ‘[Save Page Now](#)’ service.
3. Write a short abstract (one paragraph) in English summarizing the findings of your review.
4. Come up with a number of keywords that describe what aspects of the reviewed project you deal with in particular. These keywords will be used to [tag](#) your review.
5. Create a zip file of the image files that you refer to in your review (if there are any). Please make sure the images are named according to our

- guidelines (picture-1.png, picture-2.png, etc.).
6. Fill out the questionnaire.
 7. Email your review along with the abstract, keywords, and image files to the [Managing Editor](#) or the editors responsible for the issue in preparation.
 8. Have a beer. (It's on us! Remind us in case we should ever meet ☺)

We do not charge article submission or processing fees.