Paper: **"Swearing on Twitter: Khaleeji Dialect"**

Corresponding Author: Abdullah M. Al-Qattan

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Jesus Gerardo Martinez del Castillo
University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/08
Manuscript Title: SWEARING ON TWITTER: KHALEEJI DIALECT	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16.09	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/**No**	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/**No** You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
The abstract could be improved by anticipating some results	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
In the Methodology section the author explains only how they collected data; more information about the method chosen to analyse data is needed. Moreover, no information about the size of the corpus is provided.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
The author mentions a sociolinguistic approach, but in the analysis of data typical aspects of sociolinguistic analyses such as gender and age are not considered. I suggest that either the author specifies the goal in more details or they omit the reference to SL.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
More references to the results in terms of answers to the research questions could improve this section.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
For non-Arabic speakers it is not easy to understand the Appendix, which by the way is never mentioned in the text.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author,
I find your article very interesting and thought-provoking. However, some changes are needed in the Methodology section, as you can see in the grid. In addition to my notes, I would suggest that you re-think your research questions. The first and the second can be answered (What words or phrases do Khaleejis often use to swear? What is the logic behind opting for each swear word or phrase?). Concerning the third one (What do they reflect about the Khaleeji culture?) it is not clear how the method chosen can answer this question; therefore, you could refer to the cultural aspects in the conclusion. I am very confident that you will easily improve your interesting article.
Best regards

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is interesting and on the whole well-written. I am confident that the author will easily improve it.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Jesús Martínez del Castillo	
University/Country: Universidad de Almería, Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 7-09-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 9-09-2021
Manuscript Title: SWEARING ON TWITTER: KHALEEJI DIALECT	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16.09.21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**

It is a sociolinguistic study very well structured and presented *(Please insert your comments)*	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
Everything in the article is very well justified	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Sociolinguistic methods are explained very clearly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	**X**
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

(If it is of interest to the author I want to make some observations)

I want to emphasize the linguistic aspect involved in the science called Sociolinguistics. In language studies the purpose is to analyze the fact of the creation of an utterance. Language is created in the very act of speaking, an individual act consisting in speaking saying and knowing. This means that *language* does not have concrete existence, that language manifests itself in *a language* and both language and a language manifest themselves in the *speech act*. Language thus is nothing but the very act of creation made by speakers when speaking. A language, say the KHALEEJI DIALECT, is nothing but a set of forms, contents, units, rules, procedures, attitudes and beliefs functioning is a speech community (=a language). Speech acts constitute the only reality with concrete existence in speaking saying and knowing since speech acts can be verified daily

just in their birth. But speech acts would not exist unless they are created by *individual speakers* in *dialogue*, when a speaker, *the I*, addresses another speaker, *the You*, both relieving each other in their respective roles.

So for speakers, who are *creative* because they are *free* and thus *absolute*, language is nothing but *the creation of meanings* and *the objectification of meanings in contents of the conscience*. On the contrary *a language* is nothing but the set of *virtual meanings* and *means of expression* existing in the tradition of speaking, offered to speakers in the language being analyzed, the KHALEEJI DIALECT (in this case), at the disposal of its speakers. Speakers thus are *historical*, that is, *subjects creating their own historicity together with the other speakers* living in the same period of time as they themselves, and thus they are *limited* since they accept forms of speaking in force in their historical moment because speaking is speaking just as the other one in dialogue speaks. For the speaking saying and knowing subject the speech act is nothing but *the expression of their freedom and historicity*, the result of their intention to say. In this sense *when they say* something *they define themselves* before the topic they create. And this, *saying*, is possible because speakers are able to know in the peculiar creative absolute and limited way of knowing by humans, that is, the synthetic connection of intuition or synthesis of sensibility and spontaneity (=intellect).

Because of this meaning can be analyzed from three points of view: meaning is absolute, that is, *universal* (it belongs to language) thus involving *designation*; *meaning* belongs to a particular language (every language differs from the conception of meanings by other languages). In this sense meaning is *the primary structurization of facts of experience* made in a speech community (=a language), that is, meaning is *historical:* it belongs to this or that language; and meaning finally is individual, that is, *sense*, the individual use of creative absolute meaning expressed with the means of expression of a language, with the help designation and the virtual meanings of a language and determined by a *context*, *situation* and *contour*. Because of this sense goes beyond designation and meaning (sense).

Since language, that is, the speech act is created by individual subjects the purpose of language study consists in *interpreting* linguistic expressions, that is, the study of linguistic facts is *hermeneutics*, that is, it consists in determining and guessing *the individual intentional purpose of individual speakers when speaking*.

The real important value of the article being analyzed consists in the interpretation of the facts gathered. For example, the analysis and primary interpretation made by the author of the meaning of 'sheep', 'dog' and 'donkey', and other items. The interpretations made is about the meaning of those words at the level of the historical language, the KHALEEJI DIALECT. My proposal is that this analysis should be made at the level of sense thus determining the individual intentional purpose of the supposed creator of the expression, that is, the interpretation of real examples taken from the daily speech. With this you can

conclude about the sense of expressions (speech acts), and about the mode of thinking proper of the KHALEEJI DIALECT.

I agree with the author of the article when he says "It is hoped that the findings of this study are insightful for further research on swearing-related topics".

If the author or someone else is interested in the ideas above, see the articles published by me in
The European Scientific Journal December 2013 "Linguistics of Saying" Special edition, volume II.
The European Scientific Journal December 2013 "Modes of Thinking in Language Study" Special edition, volume IV
The European Scientific Journal December 2014 edition "The Speech Act" vol 10 No 11.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: