



**Language Research Center's (LRC)
Ambilingual Interdisciplinary Journal *Glossa***

Peer Review Report

This description of the editorial process is principally directed to Peer Reviewers. However, authors should also familiarize themselves with these guidelines in order to facilitate process.

Step 1: The author submits an abstract via e-mail to the Principal Editor, who determines if the article's subject matter falls within the scope of *Glossa*.

If so, the Principal Editor will ask the author to submit the full manuscript via e-mail. If not, the author will be notified and alternatives publication venues will be suggested.

Step 2: On receiving the manuscript, the Principal Editor will forward it to the appropriate members of the Review Board via e-mail.

Step 3: Two Peer Reviewers will agree to review the manuscript and will forward their recommendations to the Principal Editor via e-mail within the prescribed time-frame.

If the recommendations of two Peer Reviewers are in agreement, the article will be accepted or rejected accordingly. If there is no agreement, the Principal Editor will forward the article for additional review. Ultimately, the Principal Editor will make the final decision in such cases.

Instructions for Peer-Reviewers

Peer Reviewers will only review manuscripts in their area of expertise. Review Board members must agree to review one manuscript approximately every two to three months and complete the review within 21 days. If the Peer Reviewer is not an expert in the subject area of the manuscript in question, s/he must inform the Principal Editor. Moreover, if the Peer Reviewer cannot review the article within three weeks, s/he must inform the Principal Editor immediately.

The review process is double - blind. Peer Reviewers will have no indication of the author's identity. Similarly, the author will receive no indications of the Peer Reviewer's identity. It is the responsibility of the Peer Reviewer to ensure that any indications of his / her identity in any comments submitted are removed.

Below is the Peer Reviewer Report Form. These criteria for the review / evaluation of a manuscript are essential for Peer Reviewers and can also assist authors in the preparation of their submissions. A copy of this form will be forwarded to the Peer Reviewer with the manuscript. Conversely, the online version of this form can be used.

Peer Reviewer Report Form - LRC

<p>Peer Reviewer Report Form</p> <p>(All peer-review reports MUST be submitted on this form.)</p>	
Date:	Manuscript No.
Review Due Date:	Manuscript Title:
Reviewer:	

Please score the manuscript for editorial style, including: (1) academic tone and vocabulary choice [e.g., jargon, biased language, etc.], (2) general writing [e.g., organization, level-headings, paragraphs, transitions, etc.], (3) grammar and syntax [e.g., verb tense, subject - predicate agreement, sentence structure, run-on sentences, etc.], (4) punctuation and mechanics [e.g., periods, quotation marks, capitalization, number style, etc.], and (5) reference-list entries and in-text citations.

Please mark ONE.

40 errors or more, 30 - 39 errors, 20 - 29 errors, 10 - 19 errors, Under 10 errors

All errors MUST be **highlighted** in the manuscript. This is an important part of the review process, and reviewers, who are unable to thoroughly and accurately score the manuscript for editorial style, CANNOT act as peer reviewers.

Please rate each of the following areas. [Mark ONE only for each area].

1. Literature Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
2. Length	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
3. Clarity of Objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
4. Conceptual Rigor	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
5. Methodology	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
6. Coherence	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
7. Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
8. Title	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable*, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
	If unacceptable, please suggest alternative: _____
9. Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable*, <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, <input type="checkbox"/> Superior
	If unacceptable, please make suggestions: _____

Please rate the manuscript for significance of topic / contribution.

None, Trivial, Modest, Important, Path-breaking

Overall Recommendation

Reject Accept Subject to Minor Revision by Editor
 Return to Author for Revision Accept 'as is'

Comments for Editor

Please include a brief summary assessment and recommendations for the manuscript.

Comments for Author

Please include an evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, and specific concerns and suggestions. Do NOT include your recommendation to the Editor. The Editor reserves the right to alter any expression that s/he deems inappropriate. These comments will be forwarded to the author by the Principal Editor.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Zoran Vujisic
Director
Language Research Center
School of Social and Human Sciences
Universidad del Turabo
P.O. Box 3030
Gurabo, PR 00778-3030

Telephone: (787) 743-7979; ext. 4795

Fax: (787) 704-2731

E-mail: zvujisic@SUAGM.edu