I really enjoyed listening to this audio paper. I found that it fit well the guidelines for such a paper, interestingly and necessarily in an emergent and satisfyingly performative manner. It made me really want to hear the piece in way that only reading about it would have fallen much shorter of.

Some comments on the abstract:

The work is revisited and the discussions in this paper were reecorded [is this a typo? Should it be ‘re-recorded’ or ‘recorded’?] in the studio while the piece is recorded. The many layers of translations are traced and the various kinds of emotional responses that may be unpacked throughout the process  is discussed [I find this phrase awkward and unclear, given the minimal word count I’d suggest it is more clearly phrased]. The influenced by The many [typo] different kinds of agents that may be found is Brooks’ meta-composition makes the creative process daunting to understand also from the inside [again, rather lacking clarity as a sentence].

Keywords (5): Translation, Authenticity, Interpretation [are two missing?]

The Bibliography makes some tantalising references without actually making citing them in either the abstract or the audio paper. I’d like to understand the link, and I guess the abstract is the only place for it. As it stands at 140 words, there’s actually some more scope for extending abstract. Writing concisely with few words is always a challenge, and I do think a stronger abstract would strengthen the submission as a whole in a useful way. I’m happy to let the editors make the final call on this, but that is my academic and critical feedback. Hope it helps, and thanks for introducing me to this fascinating work and Seismograf.