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When you resubmit your paper, please provide a list of changes and, where appropriate, respond to each point which has been raised by the reviewers. Please upload these comments as a separate file during the re-submission process. Please ensure that you supply a text file prepared according to the specification in the instructions to authors and a high resolution image file of each figure in order to facilitate timely publication. It is also important to submit the text of your revised article in Word format at this stage of the process.
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Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:
Editorial comment: As you can see the reviewers felt strongly that the manuscript is worth of publication, especially because of its broad geographical sweep that contextualises the material culture and practices of this period. However, they raise some important questions around structure and terminology. In revising this manuscript, please focus particularly on the structure of your argument and how you progress through your data. Rev. 4 makes some recommendations about how you might proceed. In carrying out your revisions, please note that the EJA has a strict word limit of 8000 words (total) and 10 (total) figures and tables. You are currently slightly over the word limit.

**Reviewer #1:** Worthy article. Good sweep of comparative literature. But needs careful copy editing of English language to achieve clearer meaning and utility.

Some key words at issue - E.g. Pomerelian - surely Pomeranian? Construction= building archaeology? Pot tiles = stove tiles of vessel form. Pots = cooking pots ? And more descriptive explanation for some material categories 'heating systems' ?

Perhaps more historical/political context required for e.g. state/territory of the Teutonic Order?

Table 1 - garbled caption. Structure of ceramic vessel in ... ? Distribution of local and imported ceramics in small towns of the region in comparison to the regional major trading centre (Gdansk).

**Reviewer #2:** Comments in the attached file.

**Reviewer #3:** The proposed article 'Between centre and periphery. Material culture of small towns of Pomerelia in the period of Hanse domination' is an interesting contribution to the field or urban archeology and Hanse studies. Especially the spotlight on smaller towns in Pomerelia (partly Prussia) is valuable, showing how the towns were satellites to larger cities. They did not need to be part of a commercial network in order to echo the material culture of the larger Hanseatic centres. The approach is regional and more granular than 'one type of centre, one type of periphery'. The recommendation is to publish after some revisions. The comments are on the one hand connected to the strengthening of the main line of the argument, and on the other to provide further information.

1)      One of the conclusions, in reference to older literature and new findings on other cities is the region, is that the Hanse is not particularly visible or definable in terms of characteristics. Rather, the towns partook in a more general urban, material culture. The author states briefly in the main text that both towns belonging to the Hanse and outside of it have been investigated: this can be shown even more rigorously in the discussion (e.g. on the basis of a chosen type of findings). The author mentions some historical works which show that the Hanse was not a paramount identity marker in the cities and towns, but there is more extensive literature on the topic. It argues that the urban identities were layered and multifaceted, so the Hanse was only one of the many aspects. Even more than historical studies, art history can be of use here: there is a long scholarly discussion whether one can talk about 'Hanseatic art', and whether it is altogether purposeful in the
general context of material culture.
2)      How recent, and how extensive are the excavations mentioned? There is a reference to a Polish publication, but in the current form the reference is not informative enough. Is the article a survey of (older) reports, or is it anchored in new excavations and research? I presume the latter, but it remains unclear. This point should be mentioned in the introduction and the abstract.
3)      If these are indeed new excavations: what has been the most surprising aspect of the findings? How do they relate to small town excavations in Europe in general?
4)      The side thought on the extent to which archaeological findings, just like surviving written sources, are representative of a historical reality, is certainly interesting but somewhat underdeveloped here. A brief overview of how these parallel discussion have been conducted so far, and how they apply to the chosen case, would be in order if this point is to buttress the main argument.
5)      Are there any visual sources preserved from these towns? Since written economic sources are scarce, as the author states, it would be interesting to see how the archaeological finds relate to both written and visual sources. In other words, why should both historians and perhaps art historians read this article?
6)      Since status (expressed through objects) is being brought up: references to and reflections on literature would be in order.
7)       Interpretation of everyday life objects: is zooming out possible, in the vein of the work of Roberta Gilchrist? ('Medieval life. Archaeology and the life course', 2012)
8)       Hanseatic League: this term is becoming rather obsolete in scholarship due to the specific juridical definition of medieval leagues. 'Hanse' is often used instead.
9)      Fig. 1 includes both the towns discussed, and the major centres. Either here in a visual manner, or in an overview or a footnote, the 18 towns discussed should be specified.
10)     A couple of typos and some minor language issues need to be ironed out.

**Reviewer #4**: I like this piece overall, the relevance is well explained at the start and the question is interesting. I think is being let down slightly be a messy structure in the middle part, and by a lack of terminological clarity near the end, especially necessary because we are contrast two things (belonging to diaspora urban German culture, and belonging to the Hanse) which may actually end up looking quite similar archaeologically. So, throughout the descriptive part, it would help to have more detail on where the "German" comparanda come from and what the differences and similarities actually are - this is offered e.g. for glass, but not so clearly for architecture - and whether all of these would have somehow been equally important in creating diaspora identity. It is mentioned that e.g. housing adapts to local styles over time, but other items do not. What are the processes here? The evidence from written sources could also be made use of before the conclusion, where in turn
the distinction between periphery, semi-periphery and satellite needs to be made clearer. What is this based on? Additionally, some of the terminology is odd. E.g. none of the glass beakers on fig. 7 are rummers (which itself is not any common term used when speaking of medieval glass). Neither can I understand what the author means by “decorated with cusps”.