

Paris, July 20th

Article: « Discursive Strategies in Style Guides Negotiation on Github »

Dear colleague,

The RESET Editorial Board has reviewed the revision of your manuscript. The coordinators and reviewers are pleased to see that the comments on the first draft have been addressed. However, for the reasons discussed below, we feel that this second draft would benefit from some additional revisions.

The committee therefore warmly encourages you to resubmit a final revised version of the manuscript, following the recommendations below – where you will find general feedback from the coordinators, as well as detailed comments from the external reviewers.

The editorial board would like to receive the new version of your article by September 20, 2021. This new manuscript should be accompanied by a separate document in which you outline your main responses to the comments and questions of the coordinators and reviewers. If this last version of the manuscript is accepted for publication, we will then make some minor corrections (punctual clarifications, phrasing, typing errors, bibliography, etc.).

We remain at your disposal for any further information.

Yours sincerely,
The editorial board

General recommendations

Dear Colleague,

The RESET Editorial Board has reviewed the new version of your article, which has again generated a great deal of enthusiasm. We thank you for the serious rewriting work you've made.

The coordinators and reviewers feel that your article has been really improved. However, we believe that a few adjustments could still be done before publication.

1. Structure : data and methodology are still discussed a little late in the text. They are developed on page 7, although they are already mentioned earlier. It might be relevant to move the two sub-sections “three repositories” and “methodology” (p.7) up in the introduction, just after the research questions.

2. Analysis : verbatim from the comments could still be included in the text. It could be a way to illustrate the question of effectiveness of style guides that has not really been taken into account.

We therefore look forward to the revised version of your paper. We remind you that it must be accompanied by a separate document, which responds to the main comments of the reviews and points out the major changes made to your paper.

Yours sincerely
The coordinators

Reviews

The articles deals with the way style guides for the JavaScript programming language are discussed and negotiated on the Github platform.

The subject is really interesting and the demonstration is based on solid data.

This new version has been seriously rewritten. However, a few modifications could still be relevant.

Were the requests made during the first evaluation satisfactorily addressed? If so, please specify what remains to be addressed:

Most of the recommendations have been taken into account, in a more or less detailed way.

The length of the revised version is still a bit long although shorter than the previous one. Some cuts have been made in the first part of the text. However, the structure of the text is still a little problematic (see below)

As requested, the method section has been improved. We, now, have more information about data (size of the corpus and number of comments) and methodology (qualitative analysis of the most commented issues through the lens of Habermas's arguments typology).

The author also added a brief paragraph on potential biases in the survey defending the fact that, even if users discussing the style guides on Github do not represent the broader software development communities, they nonetheless embody "heightened forms of socio-technical interactions, which might be more faintly manifested in other developers".

Some clarifications have been added concerning the analytical framework, especially on the use of the concept of "intermediary objects".

The author has made an effort to draw more explicit comparisons between the three case studies (airbnb/javascript, Standard, prettier) by adding a few sentences in the analysis of each case and one sentence in the conclusion.

A few additions have been made about the distinction between “negotiation” and “discussion” suggested by reviewers. The tension is not deeply explored but has been taken into account.

One recommendation was less integrated: the question of the effectiveness of style guides.

Suggestions for improving the overall quality of the manuscript and other comments:

I believe the structure of the text can still be improved by exposing the methodology sooner. Data and methodology are only developed on page 7, although they are already mentioned earlier. It might be relevant to move the two sub-sections “three repositories” and “methodology” (p.7) up in the introduction, just after the research questions (instead of or to complete the paragraph “To do so, I propose to look at three GitHub repositories, each representing different approaches to style guides...” p.2). It will imply to rewrite a little the introduction in order to avoid repetitions.

Some more verbatim from the comments could still be included in the text in order to reinforce the description of the discussions. It could be a way to illustrate the question of effectiveness of style guides.

On the form, a re-reading is necessary to correct some typos.

Is the manuscript publishable as is (with a few minor corrections)? Should a new rewrite be requested? Should the manuscript be rejected?

The manuscript is relevant to the RESET issue even if some more adjustments should still be made.