

EVALUATION GRID
contributions submitted to the journal
Limbaș și context / Speech and Context International Journal
of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science

Information about the evaluator	
First name	
Last name	
Degrees	
Affiliation	
Date of evaluation	
Title of the evaluated contribution	

Evaluation Criteria and Scale

Relevance and originality of the article	Very weak (1 points)	Poor (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)	Not Applicable (0 points)

- Is the key issue of the article relevant to the objectives of the journal?
- Does the article provide new content or enriching critical analysis?
- Do the approach and analysis of the subject contribute to the advancement of knowledge?
- Do the theme or the subject provide adequate argumentation?

Comments:

Quality and scope of the theoretical framework	Very weak (1 points)	Poor (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)	Not Applicable (0 points)

- Is the theoretical framework well explained and consistent with the problem?
- Are the concepts clearly defined?
- Are the cited references adequate, appropriate, relevant, varied and recent?
- For a text with a non-empirical basis: How do you evaluate the development of the theoretical framework (its relevance and contribution to the field of study)?

Comments:

Coherence and methodological rigor (if the article is based on	Very weak (1 points)	Poor (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)	Not Applicable (0 points)

empirical data)						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Is the used methodology clearly explained? (sample, data collection, analysis)
- Is the used methodology consistent with the problem? Does it provide relevant results?

Comments:

Quality of analysis and/ or discussion	Very weak (1 points)	Poor (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)	Not Applicable (0 points)

- How do you evaluate the richness of the analysis and/or the discussion?
- Do they meet the objectives announced at the beginning of the text?

Comments:

Clarity and structure of the text, quality of the language	Very weak (1 points)	Poor (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)	Not Applicable (0 points)

- Is the text structured in a coherent way? / Is the text coherent?
- Are the conclusions clear?
- Is the article accessible to a layperson? (Is the definition of the concepts clearly explained)?
- Are grammar, syntax, spelling satisfactory for a scientific publication?
- Length of the article (apart from some exceptional cases decided in advance by the editorial staff, the journal only publishes articles containing 10 or more A4 pages, bibliography included).

Comments:

General commentary on the text and suggestions for the author:

Recommendation (tick)	Total number of points
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted without modification	24-25
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with minor modifications (specifying the modifications requested in the general comment)	21-23
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with major modifications Specifying the modifications requested in the general comment	13-20 & over
<input type="checkbox"/> Refused	under 13

Signature, stamp