# Postdigital Commons

Petar Jandrić[1] [0000-0002-6464-4142]

[1] Zagreb University of Applied Sciences, Croatia

Please see the author's self-assessment to understand why this article underwent a peer review process slightly different.

## Reviewers 1 & 2

**Matteo Stocchetti & Pekka Buttler**

We both found your chapter very interesting. We think that the postdigital is a worthwhile approach to take on the digital commons, and we appreciate the insight that this approach can engender.
It is also a very well-written text, and it could be sent on to publication pretty much as-is.

However, we think that your text misses out on some of its potential, and we'd hope you could consider taking the article a few steps further:

First, we think the concept of postdigital itself deserves a more thorough discussion, especially as the concept is likely not totally self-evident to the entire readership.

Second, and we know that it might be a big ask, we hope you could outline some of the downstream implications of reorienting research into the digital commons along more postdigital lines. This is a discussion that you could either offer as further conclusions of your chapter, or that you could approach in the final, collective chapter. If so, it would suffice if you could give us some disjointed key points that we can then work with.

## Reviewer 3
**Barbara Class**

Following our discussions in June, I have read your text with great interest and as promised come back with "critical" feedback.

First of all, the idea of postdigital commons is really a good one and a very much needed compass for current discussions on digital commons.

You will find comments in your text but basically, what I suggest, is that you broaden your understanding of the commons moving from the "resource" perspective to the "ontological shift" which foregrounds co-activity and the relational over the transactional. For this, you may read: Bollier, D. (2024). Challenges in Expanding the Commonsverse. International Journal of the Commons. https://doi.org/10.5334/ijc.1389
In French, commons approached as co-activity rather than as resource, is Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2015). Commun. Essai sur la révolution au XXIe siècle. La Découverte. + their last book: Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2025). Instituer les mondes. Pour une cosmopolitique des communs. La Découverte.

Another suggestion is to go towards a systemic approach. Maybe you know Stephen Sterling's work and the systemic approach he promotes. To address the postdigital and the entangled, this seems appropriate as a theoretical framework. See for example:
Sterling, S. (2021). Concern, Conception, and Consequence: Re-thinking the Paradigm of Higher Education in Dangerous Times [Original Research]. Frontiers in Sustainability, 2. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsus.2021.743806
Sterling, S. (2024). Learning and Sustainability in Dangerous Times: The Stephen Sterling Reader. Agenda Publishing. https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.13473649

Other comments taken out from the comments added directly in the manuscript:
- It would be great if you could make the difference between commons, common good, public good and digital public good from a critical perspective.
- "Based on this theory, I now arrive at a provisional description: postdigital commons are non-binary entities, that reach beyond mainstream dichotomy-based, determinism-based, or instrumentalism-based definitions of digital commons" => This is key and you might also have a look at Rob Farrow's article in the same EOL-OE volume: he draws a continuum from Leonelli's framing Open Science as an object *vs* a connection.
- "An Open-Source record of a population's genome is informational (because it is written in digital language of zeroes and ones), biological (because it describes genetic code of living organisms), and social (because the geographical spread of genome speaks about nutrition, migrations, and other social categories); it is bio-info-social." => Somehow this example echoes the other one on Open Access academic articles in the very first part of the article. What about going even deeper in this example addressing the underpinning philosophical orientation?