1. Publication recommendation (accept, accept with minor revisions, revise & resubmit, reject).

2. Short justification of recommendation (maximum 10 sentences).

3. Does the paper present an empirical discovery potentially of interest to most of this journal's readers? Please substantiate your answer.

4. Is the empirical content of the paper sound (e.g. fieldwork includes proper controls and comparisons, experiments well designed, etc.)? Please substantiate your answer.

5. Does the paper make a broader proposal about an aspect of linguistic theory potentially of interest to most of this journal's readers? Please substantiate your answer.

6. Is the argumentation linking the paper's broader conclusions to its empirical or theoretical premises sound? In answering this question, please substantiate your answer without regard to your personal judgments concerning the plausibility of these premises — see question 7.

7. Comment on the paper's premises or the conceptual framework that it assumes, if you believe that issues in this area are relevant to the overall evaluation of the paper.

8. Any other comments relevant to the evaluation of the paper as a whole.

9. What are your suggestions for improving the paper? (optional if your publication recommendation is "accept" or "reject", strongly recommended otherwise). If your publication recommendation was "revisions required" or "resubmit for review", your recommendations may be taken by the editor as requirements for future acceptance, unless you explicitly state otherwise, so please try to distinguish your high-priority requirements for revision from weaker suggestions.

10. Specific line-by-line comments on details of the paper. Begin each comment with a page number, example number or paragraph/line from top or bottom, as appropriate.