

# The Role of the Language Community in Peer-Review process for Collections

There is a movement to facilitate peer-review processes without bias, and in an objective manner (Wiley 2006; Open Scholar 2014; COPE 2019). Several peer-review models exist including, open, blind, double-blind, and triple-blind review. Each with their arguments for overcoming possible biases. Grissom et al. (2021) in their call for papers: “Documentation Collections: Assessment and Recognition”, suggest a possibility for a new model in which communities might have a role in peer-review. We explore the potential benefits, impacts, and challenges of “community-review as peer-review” in scholarly settings. We address four issues:

- The role of preservation institutions in influencing the review by controlling the experiential context of material interaction and engagement.
- The responsibility of scholars to make changes based on reviewers’ comments. Theiberger et al. (2016), suggest that peer-review for corpora and collections should only occur after materials are deposited in a repository. They leave open to speculation under what circumstances a depositor should be required to make changes to the initial deposit when they receive feedback about resources under review.
- The gradient line between community member review and community member contributor/curator.
- The gradient line between community member review and community use of a collection.

We affirm that peer-review is important in scholarly contexts, and likewise that customer satisfaction and product evolution are important in commercial contexts. Corpora and collections often sit at the cross-roads of scholarly output and user-centric product. In a future where community engagement with language resources is embraced, peer-review objectives need to be clear. Are the reviewers reviewing the content, or the engagement experience? Additionally, when and in what ways is it appropriate to acknowledge reviewers of corpora and collections? Addressing the relationship of community engagement in relation to peer-review is an important component in the transition from language documentation to language revitalization.

## References

- COPE. 2019. “Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers (English).” Committee on Publication Ethics. doi:[10.24318/cope.2019.1.9](https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9).
- Griscom, Richard, Lauren B. Collister, Hugh J. Paterson III. 2021. Language Documentation Collections: Assessment and Recognition [Full call for papers]. Journal of Open Humanities Data. [https://docs.google.com/document/u/1/d/e/2PACX-1vRvSJHMnWln0rIBsjmGeid9H9nJia05NdG82M\\_yDHOdn6-EiU5RC6t7qPSlfnGamTfIFoAlhPDuxT\\_/pub](https://docs.google.com/document/u/1/d/e/2PACX-1vRvSJHMnWln0rIBsjmGeid9H9nJia05NdG82M_yDHOdn6-EiU5RC6t7qPSlfnGamTfIFoAlhPDuxT_/pub)
- Open Scholar. 2014. “Independent Peer Review Manifesto”. <https://www.openscholar.org.uk/independent-peer-review-manifesto>

Thieberger, Nick, Anna Margetts, Stephen Morey, and Simon Musgrave. 2016. "Assessing Annotated Corpora as Research Output." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 36 (1): 1–21. doi:[10.1080/07268602.2016.1109428](https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2016.1109428).

Wiley. 2006 (2020). "Best Practice Guidelines on Research Integrity and Publishing Ethics". <https://authorservices.wiley.com/ethics-guidelines/index.html>