

Reviewer Guidelines

As you are reviewing the paper, please keep in mind the core tenets of high-quality scholarship: originality, argumentation, and accuracy. Consider the following questions in your determination and in your feedback to the author:

Originality:

- Does the article contribute to a larger body of knowledge?
- Would you consider the research to be sufficiently novel?
- Does the article progress the scholarship in a meaningful way?

Argumentation:

- Do the data support the generalizations and conclusions made in the paper?
- Are the arguments logically presented and supported?
- Is the argument presented in a clear and concise way?

Accuracy:

- Are the data correctly and carefully represented?
- Is the theoretical framework properly characterized?
- Does the paper cite and reference crucial and appropriate works on the topic?

You should use considerations such as these to help guide your review rather than whether or not you agree with the findings. Finally, always remember the golden rule of reviewing: “Review for others as you would have others review for you.”

**Note: The tone of the review should be critical but constructive. If your review is negative, consider giving it some time and then reread it carefully to ensure that the tone does not come across as harsh. A critical review is good and welcome, but avoid overly harsh language or what may be perceived as direct attacks on the author.*

Step-by-Step Review Process

1. Read through the paper.
2. Check that the author(s) has followed the *Author_General_Guidelines.pdf* document (in your assigned Google folder).
3. [Create a .txt \(aka 'simple text'\) file](#) in which to write your **determination**, any **revisions**, and your list of **suggestions**. These will be passed on to the author(s). Please name the file as follows:

authorlastname_ALC14_ReviewerSubmission.txt
(Ex: RomeroDiaz_ALC14_ReviewerSubmission.txt)

**Note: Any comments to Coyote Papers can be sent in an email to us. Please avoid sending comments to Coyote Papers inside the .txt file as this should be used exclusively for comments directed to the authors.*

4. Determine whether to **accept the paper as-is**, to **accept the paper with minor revisions**, or to **decline the submission**. Further detail on each category is provided below. Also consider referencing the 'aspects to keep in mind' listed above.

Accept as-is: The paper does not need revisions and the submission may be published as-is.

Accept with minor revisions: Minor revisions are suggested before publication. (i.e., There are changes that you feel are necessary to ensure quality, but these changes do not constitute a change to the core aspects of the work.) For example:

- Sources are not cited correctly in [LSA unified style](#).
- The author(s) are missing some important literature on the subject matter.
- The author(s) are missing some important methodology.
- The author(s) are missing some important aspect that can be fixed with minor revisions.

Decline submission: The submission should be declined if a major rewrite is necessary or the submission does not meet academic standards.

Possible reasons:

- This paper would require a major rewrite to be acceptable.
- The main question of this paper is actually not addressed in the content as promised.
- This paper is not up to scientific standards.
- This paper, or parts of it, are plagiarized.
- There are other reasons for which you consider this paper unpublishable (please explain).

If in doubt about your decision, feel free to contact us.

5. Write a short justification of your determination. This can be two sentences or a whole paragraph, depending on your reasons.

Note: If your determination is to **decline, please explain your decision, referencing one of the reasons given above. If the reason for your recommendation is not listed above, please explain clearly why you believe a **decline** is still warranted.*

6. If you have determined to **accept with minor revisions**, write a short list of the revisions you propose.

7. Regardless of your determination above, consider how this article can be improved and write a list of your suggestions. This feedback is greatly appreciated by authors. Please consider answering the following questions in your evaluation:

- How can this paper be improved?
- Are the objectives clear for the reader?
- What are the key aspects of the proposal? Do these work well given the proposed methodology?
- What are its strengths and weaknesses?

**Note: These suggestions are separate from the list of revisions as their inclusion by the author does not determine whether or not the paper will be accepted.*

8. Upload your completed .txt file into the same Google Folder as these instructions and the papers you have reviewed and notify Coyote Papers that you are finished with the review.

Thank you!!!

References

Guidelines for reviewers - Semantics & Pragmatics

<https://info.semprag.org/reviewers>

International Journal of American Linguistics

https://www.americanlinguistics.org/?page_id=67

Language Documentation and Conservation (online)

<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ldc/submissions/#review>

Ten simple rules for reviewers (in computational biology, 2006):

<https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.0020110>

Bioinformatics Reviewer Guidelines,

<https://academic.oup.com/DocumentLibrary/Bioinformatics/Reviewer%20Guidelines.pdf>