

Documentation for *Armarium Digital Editions*

Version 0.2 (draft), 28 July 2025: Pádraic Moran (padraic.moran@universityofgalway.ie)

Table of Contents

1. General principles.....	1
1.1 Simple technical implementation.....	1
1.2 Long-term preservation.....	1
1.3 Citability.....	2
1.4 Readability.....	2
1.5 Quality assurance.....	2
2. Editorial process.....	2
2.1 General Editor.....	2
2.2 Editorial Board.....	3
2.3 Fast-track publications.....	3
2.4 Peer-reviewed publications.....	3
2.5 Guidelines for peer-reviewers.....	4
3. Submissions.....	4

1. General principles

1.1 Simple technical implementation

The primary goal of *Armarium* is to make it as simple as possible for researchers to publish scholarly editions online. To that end, the technical barrier is kept as low as possible.

The same principle of simplicity also supports long-term preservation and readability.

Simplicity does not need to be a limitation. The data behind all of editions will be freely available to be processed and analysed in more complex applications.

1.2 Long-term preservation

The core of this resource is the XML data underlying each edition. XML is an excellent format for long-term archiving.

Both XML data and the website presentation are deposited and made publicly accessible in long-term data repositories ([GitHub](#) and [Zenodo](#)) to ensure access for future generations.

A PDF version is also generated for each edition, to offer another archiving format.

The technology behind the website (HTML, CSS and some very light PHP scripts) is kept as simple as possible, in order to minimise requirements for updating and maintenance. This will support the long-term stability of the web presentation.

Data meets the [FAIR principles](#) as far as possible. These involve ensuring that editions are:

- Findable, with unique and persistent identifiers (DOI and web URL), rich metadata containing also the identifiers, and available in other searchable resources (e.g. GitHub, Zenodo).
- Accessible, via a secure internet protocol (https), freely.
- Interoperable, using TEI XML, a widely recognised semantic mark-up.
- Reusable, under an explicit licence (usually the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#)).

1.3 Citability

Editors receive full and transparent acknowledgement for their work. Each edition is presented with a recommended citation formula at the head of every page. This will include a unique DOI as well as a simple, human-readable URL.

1.4 Readability

The primary function of any edition is to be read. *Armarium* aims to present text in a simple, uncluttered and accessible format, with attention to typographical detail (on both desktop and mobile screens). Graphical content, user-interface elements and colours are kept minimal, to support restful reading and concentration.

1.5 Quality assurance

Armarium will have an editorial board to review submissions and ensure the overall quality of the collection. Editors may also choose to avail of a more formal anonymous peer-review process (and claim peer-review status accordingly).

2. Editorial process

2.1 General Editor

The General Editor is responsible for editorial oversight, co-ordination of the editorial process, and communication with all parties.

The role involves:

1. Communication with contributors; guidance on editorial and technical requirements.
2. Communication with the Editorial Board; ensuring that peer-review process is adequately and transparently followed.
3. Managing publication of new content, including updating site content, allocation of DOIs, and archiving of new data to the data repository.
4. Liaising with technical support as necessary, including for general maintenance of the website.

The role of General Editor should ideally rotate regularly (e.g. every five years). Members of the Editorial Board would be ideal replacements.

2.2 Editorial Board

The Editorial Board should ideally consist of a minimum of four members who have some experience in textual-editing. The Board should have diversity with regard to gender, career stage, and potentially other considerations.

The role of the Board is:

1. To provide advice and support to the General Editor.
2. To make general recommendations about editorial and technical standards, and to advise on the future direction of the project.
3. To review and approve if appropriate new submissions published on a 'fast-track' basis (see below).
4. Where contributors request full peer-review, to assist the General Editor in identifying suitably qualified reviewers and to oversee the peer-review process, ensuring it is carried out to a high standard.

Members of the Editorial Board should rotate (e.g. around every five years), on a staggered basis to maintain continuity. New members are appointed by the General Editor with the approval of the Board.

The membership of the Board (current and former members) should be made public for full transparency.

2.3 Fast-track publications

Fast-track publication allows for editions to be published relatively quickly.

Publication process:

1. The General Editor checks the submitted edition for quality, and if acceptable makes a recommendation for publication to the Editorial Board.
2. The Editorial Board reviews the edition and can make further comments and recommendations.
3. If a majority of the Editorial Board approves, the General Editor proceeds to publication.

Peer-reviewed editions should be subjected to a more rigorous review process (see below).

2.4 Peer-reviewed publications

A new submission or edition already published as a fast-track publication may be submitted for a peer-review process. On success, the edition should be marked publicly as peer-reviewed.

Publication process:

1. The General Editor and Editorial Board first approves the publication (as for fast-track review above).
2. The General Editor, drawing on the advice of the Editorial Board, requests a review from at least one suitably qualified expert. The expert may be a member of the Editorial Board. The

process should be blind where possible: information identifying the contributor should be removed from the version for peer-review and the identity of reviewers should be kept confidential.

3. Each peer-reviewer produces a short report and either: a) approves publication without changes; b) requires revisions (major or minor); c) rejects the submission.
4. The Editorial Board should consider the report(s) and finalise the recommendations.
5. The General Editor oversees the implementation of any revisions. When a final version is published, the edition can be publicly designated as peer-reviewed.

2.5 Guidelines for peer-reviewers

Peer-review for *Armarium* editions should focus on the *intellectual content only*. That is to say, technical aspects of a digital edition (e.g. user-interface, accessibility, data preservation) should not be the concern of peer-reviewers for individual editions. (These aspects could instead be evaluated by a reviewer of the entire resource who has special expertise in Digital Humanities.)

For this reason, editions can be supplied to peer-reviews in XML form, but more likely also in PDF or other easily readable format.

The peer-reviewer should apply normal standards for their field, including but not limited to any of the following considerations:

- Overall scholarly contribution
- Accuracy of text (based on sampling, if appropriate)
- Accuracy and value of editorial interventions
- Value of critical apparatus and notes
- Value of source apparatus (if supplied)
- Transparency of editorial principles, as presented in the introduction
- General value of the introduction
- Comprehensiveness of the bibliography

3. Submissions

Content should be supplied in XML conforming to the recommendations of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI). See short documentation below and XML templates available on GitHub (<https://github.com/padraicmoran/Armarium/>).

For the structure of the TEI header, see the templates provided.

The introduction to the edition should be structured as follows:

```
<div type="introduction" xml:lang="en">
  <head>Introduction</head>
  <div type="main">
```

```

<head n="1">Subheading title</head>
<div>Content</div>

<head n="2">Subheading title</head>
<div>Content</div>

<head n="3">Subheading title</head>
<div>
  <head n="3.1">Nested subheading title (optional)</head>
  <div>Content</div>
</div>

<div>
  <head n="3.2">Nested subheading title (optional)</head>
  <div>Content</div>
</div>

  [etc.]
</div>
<div type="bibliography">
  <head n="4">Bibliography</head>
  <div>Content...</div>
</div>
</div>

```

The main text of the edition should be structured as follows:

```

<div type="edition" xml:lang="la">
  <div type="section" xml:id="s01" n="Section short title"1>
    <head>Full title for section</head>
    Content
  </div>

  <div type="section" xml:id="s02" n="Section short title">
    <head>Full title for section</head>
    Content
  </div>

  [etc.]
</div>

```

See templates for standard mark-up for manuscript transcription, critical apparatus, notes, cross-references, etc.

Customised mark-up (ideally TEI compliant) can be introduced, though the XSLT files for the edition would need to be customised accordingly.

1 The short titles for sections will appear in the edition's table of contents.