

Review by Louis de Saussure

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

Yes. The suggestion to consider NIMPF in French as a speech act operator is sound, elegant and novel.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

Yes.

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

Overall the argumentation is interesting and sound. However the notion that the viewpoint approaches are only about "internal focalization" is erroneous, as indicated in the annotated PDF, and should be correctly addressed. In the same vein, the main argument about the viewpoint theory of NIMPF revolves around the adverb "deja", which is discussed by the author but unfortunately not the key example of the literature (also noted in the attached annotated PDF). This should definitely be considered.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

Nothing that I can see.

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

No

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

Many strange formulations in English; the paper looks oftentimes not very professional in terms of language and style. A thorough proof-reading must absolutely be performed.

See attached annotated PDF for comments and advices.