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**Directions**

Thank you for participating in the Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI) Pilot Working Group as a reviewer.

ATI is a new approach to transparency in qualitative and multi-method research. It allows authors to enhance their work by linking to excerpts from data sources, to the actual data sources themselves, and to analytic notes discussing how data were generated and/or analyzed. You can learn more about ATI on the QDR web site [here](https://qdr.syr.edu/guidance/ati-at-a-glance) and [here](https://qdr.syr.edu/discover/accessing-ati-pilots), and in the attached “Guide to ATI.”

The purpose of the ATI pilot group is to better understand if and how ATI achieves its goals and if there are areas where it could be improved. We are interested in your assessment of, and comments and suggestions for improvement regarding, two separate aspects of ATI: the technology itself, and the substantive effect of employing ATI.

We ask that you perform your review in three separate steps. First, read the article without the ATI and then answer the questions under *Pre-Analysis*. Next, open the annotation view of the article and, while you read the article together with the annotations, answer the questions under *Analysis.* We would like for you to engage deeply with the annotations and the material they link to , but on your own “terms,” i.e., your “path” through the materials is entirely up to you. Finally, we will request that you offer some overall reflections. Please wait to consider the questions in the “Reflection” section until you have finished the other sections.

***FEEDBACK to QDR***

(*Will not be seen by author[s] of article)*

Please include here any reactions or critiques that you are offering only for QDR’s internal purposes and not for sharing with the author. Feel free to add to your discussion as you consider the different sections below.

***OVERALL FEEDBACK***

(*Will be forwarded to the article’s author[s])*

**Pre Analysis**

Read abstract and conclusion

* Briefly summarize types of data / sources / evidence that you expect the author to provide.

Read the article. Annotate the PDF of the article (using the tools built into your PDF reader) noting places where you expect, or want clarification about ...

* production/generation of data
* interpretation of data
* larger context of data
* information about from where, specifically, in the source the author is drawing information (e.g. where in a source document a claim is supported).
* further justification for a claim
* any other (empirical) aspect

Please also note places where you would expect the author to provide the underlying data source (or would expect the author to justify why they cannot provide the source).

**Analysis**

Open the version of the article with the author’s annotations. Provide an answer to each of the bolded instructions covering the questions below it.

**Skim the article comparing your “calls for annotation” to the author’s annotations.**

* Did the author provide expected annotations?
	+ Did the annotations fulfill the expectation you had for them?
	+ What was missing?
	+ What was unexpected, and did this help clarify an argument?
* Did the author provide the data that you hoped/expected them to provide (or explain why they could not)?

**Thinking holistically about the article (and offering examples where useful)**:

* Where excerpts were provided, did they help strengthen interpretations, or did they make claims less plausible?
* Where full data sources were provided, how did you interact with those sources? Did they help to support the argument in the way the author envisioned
* Were analytic notes helpful? Why or why not? Were there annotations where additional information would have been helpful for interpreting the relation between an excerpt and/or data source and a passage in the article? Where?

**Re-read the annotated article from beginning to end and consider:**

* How did you interact with the annotations? (E.g. skim them and return to the most important ones later, read all of them and look at data files later, click on something in them and end up somewhere else entirely on the internet, etc.)
* Which annotations did you find most interesting/valuable? Which ones least so?
* How did you find the usability/reading experience of the article with the annotations?
	+ Was there anything in particular you enjoyed?
	+ What was annoying or could have been better?

**Reflection**

Considering the version of the article with the author’s annotations, provide a single, longform answer to each of the bolded instructions. Your answer should cover all questions/topics listed.

**How well did the annotations support the following aspects of the article you reviewed**:

(Please explicitly address each of these categories)

* Thesis: Support of main argument or thesis
* Claims: Supporting individual claims advanced by the author
* Trust: Overall trust in source
* Method: Comprehension of methods used / logic of analysis
* Access: Ability to locate and evaluate a data source that was used by the author

**Do you feel as if you understood the article better with the annotations, or did they somehow detract more than they added?**

**With regard to ATI as an approach to annotating qualitative research:**

* Is there anything else ATI should offer/allow that would make it more helpful, e.g., a different category in the annotations?
* How did you find interacting with the Hypothes.is interface? What could be improved?