

SINTAGMA

REVISTA DE LINGÜÍSTICA / JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS

Referee report (anonymous)

IMPORTANT: If the paper is simply a compilation of previously published research, it should be rejected, and there is no need to respond to all the sections in this Review Form. You may proceed to the final section where the 'REJECT' option should be selected. The paper should only be accepted, with or without changes, if it includes a critical view and an original contribution to the field. In this case, you may also skip the detailed sections in the Review Form and include your recommendations in writing.

Title of the paper:

1. From the point of view of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation and spelling, the paper is:

☐ Correct

☐ Not totally correct. There are some mistakes and they are the following:

page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:

☐ Incorrect. It should be returned to the author, Examples of problems:

page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:

2. From the perspective of inclusive and non-sexist language, the wording is:

☐ Correct

☐ Not totally correct. There are some mistakes and there are the following:

page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:

☐ Incorrect. It should be returned to the author. Examples of problems:

page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:

3. The style and the text organization are:

☐ Correct

☐ Not totally correct. There are some mistakes and there are the following:

page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:

☐ Incorrect. It should be returned to the author. Examples of problems:

page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:
page	paragraph	:

4. The interest of the topic of the paper is:

☐ High

☐ Average, because

☐ Low, because

5. The methodology followed for the study is:

(It does not apply in non-empirical works)

☐ Clearly presented.

☐ Somewhat unclear. Problems:

☐ Not clearly presented. Problems:

6. The scientific relevance of the paper is:

- ☐ High, because it makes significant contributions to the field.
☐ Dubious, because it makes contributions of little relevance.
☐ Very low, because it makes no significant contribution to the field.

7. The bibliographic references used in the paper are:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Up-to-date | <input type="checkbox"/> Abundant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Relatively up-to-date | <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not up to date | <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient |

8. The manuscript has potential to open new lines of research:

- ☐ Very much
☐ To some extent
☐ Little
☐ Not at all

9. From an ethical standpoint, it contains sexist, racist, LGBTI-phobic and/or ableist content:

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

DECISION:

I consider that the work (*you should choose one of the options*):

☐ **Can be published** as it is. However, the paper can be improved if the following **suggestions** are followed:

☐ **Can** be published after a **minor revision**. The author **must** improve it at least in relation to these points:

☐ **Could** be published after a **major revision**. The author **must** improve it at least in relation to these points:

☐ **Cannot** be published.

Additional comments:
