

Paper: “**Broadening Relevance: The Polemic Property of Concepts in Metaphorical Language**”

**Submitted: 15 November 2020**

**Accepted: 04 December 2020**

**Published: 31 December 2020**

Corresponding Author: Salim Bouherar

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n35p19

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marinella Lorinczi  
University of Cagliari, Italy

Reviewer 2: Djimet Fouria  
University of Doba, Chad

## ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: 16/11/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/11/20
Manuscript Title: <b>Broadening relevance: the polemic property of concepts in metaphorical language</b>	

ESJ Manuscript Number: 11153/20
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
The study methods are not explained clearly. The authors use psycholinguistics theories as the basis of their reflection but they do not mention it anywhere.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- I suggest that you place direct long quotations that are 40 words or longer in a free-standing block of typewritten lines and omit quotation marks; that you start the quotation on a new line, indented ½ inch from the left margin.
- It is advised to use this example: in her list of rules for roommates (**Anderson, 1984**)... instead of in her list of rules for roommates (Anderson 1984)...
- Verify the APA citation style as regards the difference in citing books and articles.
  
- In the text, do not use the first person, i.e. "I", "we", "my" "our", etc. For example, rather than "I show that..." or "I argue..." write "This paper shows that..." or "As argued here ... ". Rather than "We found... " write "As demonstrated here...".
  
- In my opinion paragraphs must be reorganized.
  
- It would be better to say a few things about psycholinguistics, which is the basis of your analysis, and to explain your methods.

**1. Spelling:**

Is it Vega-Moreno or Vega Moreno (p. 1 and 2)?

**2. Year**

Casasanto, D., and Lupyan, G. (2014) (p. 10): is it 2015 or 2014?

**3. Syntax**

The sentence: “the idea that metaphors require both broadening and narrowing...(p. 4)” must be rephrased.

**4. Punctuation**

Please rephrase this sentence: Yet, Carston (2010, 2012; Wilson and Carston 2007, Carston and Wearing 2011) points out that... (p. 3). It is better to write: Yet, Carston (2010) points out that... Similarly Recanati (2004) ... and Barsalou (2005) look at concepts as incomplete patterns to be filled in various occasions. Put a coma before “and Barsalou (2005)...

Although there are other approaches to metaphorical figures processing which offer interesting explanations of the metaphorical phenomena it would be ...(p.7). Please add a coma before 'it would be' ...

**5. Missing article**

on one hand (p. 3), it must be "on the one hand".

**6. Correlative conjunctions**

I suggest: since it should **not only allow** flexibility of semantic associations but also a reconsideration of concepts as entities... (p. 1).

more recent studies not only argue for a less promiscuous type of concepts, but they call for a redefinition of concepts (p. 4). In my opinion it should be ".....but they also call..."

**7. Missing 's'**

Research conducted by Cameron and Deignan (2006) show that (p.3), it must be 'shows'.

**Let take example** (21) *to make a pig of one's self*, in my opinion it must be "let us take example (21)"

**8. Parallel structure**

assuming that all speakers possess the same conceptualisation of the surrounding or **sharing** the same cultural assumptions (p. 5). I suggest 'or share' the same...

**9. Sentence fragments**

There is a verb missing in this sentence: Although the comprehensive attribute to the principle of relevance... (p. 8).

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

## ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: Marinella Lőrinczi	
-----------------------------------	--

University/Country: Italy			
Date Manuscript Received: 24.2020	Nov.	Date Review Report Submitted: Dec.2.2020	
Manuscript Title: Broadening relevance: the polemic property of concepts in metaphorical language			
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---153.11.2020---			
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments) English is not my mother tongue</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Please, clarify and make explicit the concept of "imperialist features of processing"</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>supported by the content.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> But, it would always be preferable to use literature written in other languages as well, eg. in French. In this case, the English bibliographic monolingualism is in contrast precisely with the subject that places the metaphor, its production and understanding, in an intercultural space.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Bibliographic multilingualism enriches everyone.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**THANK YOU!**