

PiHPh pre-publication evaluation

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate this article for PiHPh. The questions below can be used to guide your evaluation. Should you find any problems, there are three options. Firstly, if you encounter a small error (e.g. typo or minor non-nativism), **please correct this directly** on the manuscript you have been sent. However, we do not expect you to have to do this throughout the text. If the text contains numerous errors of this sort, please notify us by email at pihph@mlist.is.ed.ac.uk. Secondly, if you wish to make a longer comment in connection with any of the questions below, please do so using the comment box function (either in the Word document or to a pdf version). Thirdly, if there are other issues that you wish to make us aware of, please notify us by email.

Formatting and writing

1. Does the submission use the appropriate font?
2. Does the submission make appropriate use of section headings (see template)?
3. Does the reference list conform to the standards of the Unified Style Sheet for Linguistics?
4. Are in-text references/citations appropriately formatted?
5. Is the final word-count of the submission within the range of 4,000-7,000 words?
6. Are headings consistently numbered?
7. Are figures and examples consistently numbered?
8. Are footnotes consistently numbered?
9. Does the submission use too many footnotes?
10. Are footnotes of appropriate length?
11. Is the glossing of examples appropriate?
12. Are adequate English translations of non-English text provided?
13. Does the submission contain a high number of typographic errors?
14. Does the text contain a high number of apparent non-nativisms?

Content

15. Do you feel that there are any key references missing from the submission?
(Please make a note **on the manuscript** in the appropriate place if answering YES).
16. Do you think omission of these references constitutes a major problem for the submission?
(Please provide details by email if answering YES).
17. Are the claims/arguments/opinions expressed in the submission reasonable?
(Please provide details by email if answering NO).
18. Does the submission assess previous work on the subject in a suitably critical and balanced way? (Please provide details by email if answering NO).
19. Are the authors too dismissive of other work? Do the authors criticise other work too aggressively or unfairly? (Please provide details by email if answering YES).

Overall impressions of the submission

20. Does the subject of the submission fall within your area of expertise?
21. Do you consider it suitable for immediate online publication in PiHPh?
22. Would the submission benefit from feedback from an additional reviewer before publication?

Review comments

Please provide some brief comments on the submission (these need not be of the length or depth usually expected of a full peer review). Your commentary should reflect your reaction to the scholarly content of the submission. You may highlight the overall contribution that this submission makes to a specific debate, or focus your comments on particular aspects of the work that are most meaningful to you as an evaluator. Please note that the comments you provide here **will be posted online** along with the final publication version of this article. The authors will then have the opportunity to respond directly to any points you choose to raise. Do take care to provide only **positive** and **constructive** comments: please also indicate in your email if you wish these comments to be posted anonymously. You can email your comments to us at pihph@mlist.is.ed.ac.uk.