



REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: “Extended Conceptual Metaphor View Applied to Translation: Some Implications in Languages for Specific Purposes”

Submitted: August 2022

Accepted: October 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Carmen Mateo Gallego

Email: mateogallegoi@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/llc.v10no2a3

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dorjana Klosi

Reviewer 2: Blind

Published: 31.10.2023

---

## LLC Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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

***LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts.***

Reviewer Name:	Reviewer Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 1 July	Date Review Report Submitted: August 23, 2023
Manuscript Title: Extended Conceptual Metaphor View applied to Translation: Some Implications in Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP)	
Manuscript Number: LLC-2302	
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 number rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each rating.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents aims, methods and results.</b>	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	2
<i>Methodology is not a central part of this paper – it is more an overview of CMT and ECMT.</i>	
<b>4. The results are clear and consistent with the aims.</b>	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>5. The discussion and conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	3
<i>The conclusions could be more pertinent to the title – referring to ECMT in LSP. The conclusions lack reference to results in this area.</i>	
<b>6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)Please check the references in the bibliography correspond with those in the texts.</i>	
<b>7. There are grammar and spelling errors.</b>	4
<i>In some parts the English is ungrammatical, I recommend the paper is read by a mother tongue speaker - Sometimes there are repetitions of words e.g. this ... this .... The author should substitute the repetitions to improve the overall impression of the paper.</i>	

**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):**

I have made some comments on the pdf of the manuscript.

Rep – repetition

Gr – grammar needs checking

The paper is certainly original and makes relevant and innovative points about CMT, ECMT and translation in relation to LSP.

However sometimes these points are discussed superficially. I would have liked to see more examples – perhaps examples in a case study corpus, rather than just the odd example out of context here and there. I suggest a case study text (which can be a short paragraph) – for example a text from a business journal, or from an annual business report etc., and its translation – involving examples of metaphor translation from one language into another. This would make the paper more complete.

More could be said about business translation, and LSP in this area – which is mentioned in the abstract.

I also found that the sections overlapped - for example Extended C.Metaphor Theory seemed to overlap into the next section Extended C.Metaphor Theory and Translation - I think the divisions could be better marked.

Perhaps a section dedicated to the literature in the past could be one section to reduce the size of the sections and make the paper easier to read.

Some paragraphs were quite complex and could be simplified in order to explain a very valid concept. I identified one paragraph.

Also the conclusions do not sufficiently mention *extended conceptual metaphor theory* – more can be said about the application of this theory in order to refer back to the title and the main aim of the paper, which is to highlight its application in translation and LSP.

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



International Journal of Linguistics,  
Literature and Culture