Response to reviewer comments:

I am grateful to the reviewer for the thoughtful, specific feedback to strengthen this article. I have completed revisions using the five guiding principles outlined in the feedback. The result was a reorganization and rewriting of the abstract, introduction, and first sections. Nearly every markdown cell has been edited as a result, including in the final sections that contextualize the results of the Margherita Costa inquiry. Here is a summary of changes made:

1. First person voice.

As both the developer of the tools being evaluated and author of the subsequent research, this aspect was challenging to untangle. I have revised the language so that the project and the tools are the subjects of the sentences and paragraphs. I have moved the project credits to the end of the article. I also note that JDH has moved to single-blind review.

2. Age of project and age of contextualizing scholarship.

New historical contextualization has been added, which shows how this set of tools was the product of a certain moment in the changing shape of digital humanities. Until the launch of JDH, there had not been a suitable way to publish work like this, since it ultimately benefits from the experimentation facilitated by mybinder and the hermeneutic layer of the articles.

3. Exposition of the problem.

I have worked to clarify that the tools in GaLiLeO inhabit a third space of encounter between the historian or literary scholar and digital or computational tools that is neither a digital archive nor a distant reading of a corpus. I have removed the ancillary arguments about the *wunderkammer* and Ginzburg's conceptualization of strangeness. This focuses the paper on how the digital and computational tools point to small-scale interpretive pathways through a corpus (the realm of non-digital humanists) rather than declare a quantitative definition of an aspect of a corpus for interpretation (which is often the aim of DH tools, methods, and research questions). A new diagram demonstrates this methodological space in relationship to data carpentry workflows.

The revisions clarify that the state of the available corpus for use with the prototype and the needs of the target audience shifted the goals of the tools to smaller-scale discoveries. This was not an attempt to translate results across digital humanities/traditional humanities paradigmatic lines; humanists have similar paradigms, but operate at different scales. More details have been provided about the corpus.

These changes attempt to balance the concerns of the reviewer with the guidance provided by the editors of the special issue for which this article is intended: "We suggest you use the journal’s narrative layer to present the background of the project/theme in question and to locate the tool within a broader methodological context/tradition. This is also a good space to provide a broader critical reflection on the method as such. We suggest you use the hermeneutical layer as a space for giving a guided, narrated example of what the digital tool in question can do (call it a scientifically informed tutorial, if you wish). This will also be a good place to reflect on specific methodological choices/possibilities and their implication."

4. Contextualization of outcomes.

Given the refinement of the problem, the outcomes in the later sections of the article have now been contextualized and evaluated insofar as they do or do not solve that problem.

The bibliography suggested has been incorporated, mostly to clarify how the corpus limitations forced the tools toward a different outcome than many DH projects.

5. Structure.

Following the advice of the reviewer, I have significantly revised the structure of the opening sections of the article. The first section now provides an overview of the problems addressed by the project, rather than a descriptive complete project history. The second section engages with the method of tool development and related scholarship. The third section focuses on the corpus and data derived from it.