

**Subject:** Invitation to Review for the Journal of Semantics

Dear Dr. NAME,

Manuscript ID (NUMBER) entitled "TITLE" has been submitted to the Journal of Semantics. The abstract appears at the end of this letter. Would you be willing to referee this manuscript? If so, could we have your report within 6 weeks? [The 'official' JS letter is appended at the end of this message].

A general note about standards of publication: We impose *very* rigorous standards. When preparing your report, we would like you to keep in mind that we aim to be the premier journal in semantics.

On a practical level:

1. Please click on the appropriate link at the bottom of the page to automatically register your reply with our online manuscript submission/review system.
2. Once you accept my invitation to review this manuscript, you will be notified by email about how to access ScholarOne Manuscripts (= our online manuscript submission/review system). You will then have access to the manuscript and referee instructions in your Referee Centre.

Thanks,

NAME OF EDITOR

Associate Editor, Journal of Semantics

PS: We try *very hard* to keep the deadlines that we announce to our authors. We will fully understand if you cannot accept to referee the paper, but in case you do accept the task, we would be grateful if you could submit your review in a timely fashion. If you decline our invitation, it would be very helpful if you could suggest some names of alternative reviewers to us.

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS GO HERE (TITLE AND ABSTRACT)

\*\*\*\*\*

Please take into account the following consideration when you prepare your report. First of all, please aim to strike a collegial and cooperative tone in your review. Second, to make the review report optimally helpful to both the journal editors and the author(s), please distinguish clearly between (I) the attractive features of the paper, (II) aspects of the paper that require change in order for the article to be published (or issues that prevent publication altogether), and (III) points that can optionally be taken into account. In particular, apart from an assessment of whether the paper's content is logically sound and technically correct, we would also like to know whether you think the paper has a significant enough value for the field, bearing in mind that advancement of the field is not merely to be found in new tools and solutions, but can potentially also come from presenting new questions and puzzles.

We would appreciate your overall evaluation of the paper, bearing in mind the following categories:

1. Accept, possibly with minor revisions
2. Accept with major revisions
3. Revise and resubmit: possibly acceptable after major revisions
4. Reject

The online editorial system (ScholarOne) will allow you to specify any comments that are intended solely for the handling Editor. The handling Editor will normally forward all other comments (without your name!) to the author. Furthermore, after the editorial decision has been taken, the decision as well as all anonymised reports will be forwarded to you and the other referee(s). Please let us know in advance if you object to this.