

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Thank you for accepting being a reviewer for *Research in Corpus Linguistics*, whose reputation for excellence depends upon the professionalism of its volunteer reviewers.

Below are some general guidelines to help you out in the review process and the writing of your report. We would kindly request to follow these guidelines. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact the Editors at [ojs@aelinco.es](mailto:ojs@aelinco.es)

1. **Timeline.** Please try to meet the deadline given. If you cannot meet the deadline, please let the Editors know when to expect your review.
2. **Disclose potential conflicts of interest.** RiCL follows a strict double-blind peer review process. If you think that you cannot give an impartial review, either because you recognize an author's work or because of any other reason, please notify the Editors to disqualify yourself.
3. **Report suspected plagiarism.** All the manuscripts submitted to RiCL are run through a plagiarism detection software. However, the software will not work with, for example, papers that have been published in one language and then translated into English. If you notice plagiarism or other breaches of ethics during your review, notify the Editors.
4. **Disclose limitations.** If you are uncertain about some aspects of a manuscript or believe certain aspects of a manuscript are outside your expertise, please notify the Editors.
5. **Manuscripts should be considered confidential.** Under no circumstances should you distribute them further or make any other use of them.

**As far as the comments for authors are concerned, please consider the points below.**

1. **Do not identify yourself** or your institution in your comments for the authors.
2. **Do not include overall recommendations** in your comments to the authors (*This paper is publishable/acceptable/should not be published*, etc.). General recommendations should appear only in comments you provide separately for the Editors.
3. **Comments can be made either in the original manuscript, in the box provided by the system or in both.**

4. Authors will receive an anonymous copy of your comments. Always be **polite, scholarly, detailed and constructive**.
5. Even if you think a manuscript is seriously flawed, try to **give the author suggestions as to how it might be improved**.

**Concerning the contents of the submission, please pay attention to the general points below.**

1. **Linguistic accuracy.** Is the submission written in correct, academic English? Are there any typos that need be corrected? Is the text readable? Are sentences too long as to hinder reading? Is the text well punctuated?
2. **Topic relevance.** Is the topic of the submission within the [aims and scope](#) of RiCL? Is the topic relevant to the field of Corpus Linguistics? Does the paper contribute to enlarge our knowledge of a language, a language family or any type of cross-linguistic phenomena, construction or assumption within the framework of Corpus Linguistics?
3. **Structure.** Does the paper follow a clear structure with relevant sections? Does the structure of the paper facilitate reading and comprehension of the contents?
4. **Research questions.** Are the research questions, goals or aims of the paper clearly stated in the introductory section?
5. **Methodology.** Does the paper follow a transparent methodology? Is the corpus/corpora sufficiently described in the methodology section? Does the paper describe the software or method for data extraction?
6. **Results.** Are the results relevant? Do they respond to the research questions posited by the paper? Are explanations clear and coherent in view of the data obtained?
7. **Only for research papers reporting on corpus construction, annotation, the development and application of corpus tools, software.** Does the paper include information about the **availability** of the tool/software/corpus being described and a discussion of **potential applications**?
8. **Bibliography.** Does the paper include a sufficiently grounded review of the literature? Are references up to date? Are quotations sufficiently clear and references to them given appropriately (e.g. with clear page numbers when necessary)?

**As regards your recommendation or final decision on the publication of the submission, please select one of the three options below.**

1. Accept with minor revisions.
2. Accept with major revisions.
3. Decline submission.