# Test simulations: Review reports for Lo Vecchio submission vs. ChatGPT

The following document compares the peer review reports received from *mediAzioni* with simulations conducted on 3 February 2024 using the original draft version submitted to the journal on 29 June 2023. The tests provide convincing evidence ChatGPT was the platform used to generate the reports. (I also made attempts to use Google Bard and Microsoft Copilot, but these were unable to handle the task as presented due to their functional limitations.)

The results here are drawn from three different simulations in ChatGPT 3.5 and one in ChatGPT 4; each one divided up the material differently. Due to the limitations of ChatGPT, the full length of article text could not be input into the platform at the same time, but had to be broken down into several chunks. This leads to potential variation between the original robot reviews and those I simulated, since I do not know how the other manipulators of my text ingested it into the commercial platform. Nor do I know the exact prompts they provided or the amount of human post-editing applied. Also, as noted in the annotated reports (published 31 January 2024 on my blog, there citing Hosseini and Horbach 2023), the problem of irreproducibility is pervasive in LLMs; the same prompt leads to at times significantly different responses.

I began with the exact prompts from the review reports, with additional clarifications as needed. Here, due to time constraints, the responses are pasted prompt by prompt. The formatting below is not identical to the original chat; links to the original chats or to my earlier article draft may be provided to select parties for additional testing. The massive overlap in the text patterns transversally across the two reviews and across the individual questions could be subject to a significant comparative analysis. Digital forensic scrutiny would provide more detailed proof. For an in-depth analysis, control samples would be required, to test the reviews against known AI text patterns as well as against writing samples of the alleged human reviewers and a large set of human review reports from academic journals.

Here, I have selectively highlighted recurring words and phrases in green. For each such phrase (and others), please search for concordances using Word’s search function; in some cases the same phrase repeats dozens of times throughout. Compare the text patterns described in the annotated review reports, such as the omniscient point of view, formal correctness, overuse of text connectors, unspecific or meaningless content, wordiness, condescending overexplanation, and so forth – all too numerous to highlight here.

On a personal note, this was the first time I have used such platforms: I manipulated them as a beginner. For all the hype, I must say I was left unimpressed by the superficial, random, erroneous text analysis it provided, as well as by many breakdowns and outright falsities. I continuously had to ask the AI to limit its extremely verbose responses: with such poor output, the less said the better. I am in disbelief that a portion of humanity is now relying on such a deeply flawed and radically anti-intellectual tool for unsuited tasks: the very opposite of thought.

See all original details on the matter here:

“Unethical academics, AI, and peer review,” 20 December 2023

https://nicospage.eu/unethical-academics-ai-and-peer-review

“Update on AI peer review incident: Journal response,” 31 January 2024; updated 7 February 2024

https://nicospage.eu/update-on-ai-peer-review-incident-journal-response

**Nicholas Lo Vecchio**

**7 February 2024**

# Review 1

# 1.1. Does the paper present original research?

**REVIEW 1:** The paper under review focuses on a specific area of study – the role of translation in the development and spread of LGBTIQ+-related lexis, with a case study on the word ‘gay’. While the author does adopt a unique perspective, the topic is not novel and has been analysed frequently in the field of queer studies. One the of most interesting aspects, however, is represented by the historical examples of LGBTIQ+-related words, both contemporary and past ones, and their relationship with translation and language contact. This historical context adds an original dimension to the research. Additionally, another element that makes the paper original is the investigation into the spread of the term ‘gay’ in different language communities (Spanish, French, and German) starting in the 1950s, which is a comparative and multilingual approach that offers original insights into the dynamics of lexical transfer. Still, the paper needs to be more critical in the way it approaches the issue at hand. The author seems to refer particularly to previous studies carried by themselves. Expanding the context of research by focusing on other relevant research could more clearly occupy the niche they are occupying.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper presents original research in the field of LGBTQ+ terminology and translation practices. It meticulously examines historical documents and sources, providing a comprehensive overview of the evolution of LGBTQ+ terms across different languages. The author’s analysis of extralinguistic events, such as the Stonewall riots and LGBTQ+ activism, in conjunction with linguistic developments, offers a unique perspective on how language change is intertwined with social change. However, while the paper draws on existing scholarship, it could further strengthen its originality by delving into more contemporary debates within the LGBTQ+ community, exploring how emerging identities and expressions are shaping new terminology and translation challenges. Nevertheless, the paper’s contribution lies in its thorough historical analysis and its ability to connect linguistic shifts with broader societal shifts, making it a valuable addition to the field of translation studies and LGBTQ+ studies.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper does present original research in terms of its exploration of LGBTQ terminology evolution and its connection to sociopolitical developments. However, its originality may be limited by the fact that it heavily relies on existing literature and sources, such as historical documents and previous studies, to support its arguments. While the author does engage in a substantial analysis of these sources, there is a potential need for more primary research, such as interviews with LGBTQ activists or speakers of various languages, to enhance the paper’s originality further. Additionally, the paper primarily focuses on the adoption and adaptation of terms like “gay” and “queer” without delving deeply into other LGBTQ-related language changes, which might limit its scope and originality. Overall, while the paper contains valuable insights, a more extensive engagement with primary research and a broader exploration of LGBTQ linguistic dynamics could enhance its originality.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, the paper presents original research by investigating the historical development of the term “gay” in the context of LGBTQ+ communities across different languages. The author conducts a thorough analysis of various linguistic and translational aspects to trace the evolution of this term. By examining historical documents and translations, the study provides valuable insights into how linguistic and sociocultural factors influenced the adoption and adaptation of the term in different regions. This research contributes to our understanding of how language reflects and shapes identity within the LGBTQ+ community and highlights the intricate process of lexical transfer between languages. However, it’s important to note that while the paper offers a comprehensive historical overview, a more critical examination of the methodological approach and potential limitations could enhance its overall rigor.

**ChatGPT 4:** The claim that the paper presents original research would be strengthened if it provided clear methodological details and demonstrated a systematic approach to data collection and analysis. While the author delves into a lexicological study of LGBTQ-related terms and their translations, the originality would be more evident if there was a distinct framework or model applied to this analysis, which is not explicitly mentioned. Moreover, the paper’s originality might be called into question if it does not sufficiently differentiate its findings from prior studies. It references various works, such as those by Lo Vecchio and others, but it is crucial to establish how this research builds upon or diverges from these existing scholarly contributions. The case study does seem to offer new interpretations and potentially uncovers lesser-known historical data, yet it would benefit from more explicit comparisons to prior research to highlight its novelty. In the realm of translation studies, demonstrating originality often requires showing new patterns or unexplored phenomena. The paper points to this by discussing the translation of “GAY” and related terms in activist and academic circles. However, critical examination demands questioning whether these findings reveal new insights about the role of translation in sociolinguistic change, or if they reiterate what is already known within the discipline. Originality in research is most convincing when it challenges, refines, or significantly adds to the understanding of a topic, which in this case would mean offering new conceptual insights or revealing previously undocumented translational phenomena.

# 1.2. Is the author explicit about what knowledge s/he is adding to the knowledge already presented elsewhere?

**REVIEW 1:** The paper would benefit from a more robust exploration of the existing literature concerning queer approaches to lexicological analysis in order to provide a stronger foundation for their study. While Section 2 – Toward linguistic self-determination in the twentieth century does offer some context, there are instances where the paper makes generalisations that could benefit from past empirical studies or clear references to existing research. Additionally, it is important to note that the author appears to heavily rely on their own previous work throughout the paper. This reliance on their own research can lead to a degree of circularity in the approach. In other words, the author is using their own research to support their current claims, which can create a closed system of validation without seeking external or diverse sources of evidence or viewpoints. This can potentially limit the objectivity and breadth of the research, as it relies predominantly on a single source (i.e., the author’s own work) for support. To enhance the rigour and credibility of the paper, it is advisable to incorporate a more extensive range of references and perspectives.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author is relatively clear about the specific knowledge they are contributing to the existing body of research. They focus on the historical evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology and its translation across multiple languages, emphasizing the interconnectedness of linguistic change and social movements. The paper contributes by meticulously tracing the development of terms, highlighting their origins, translations, and adaptations. However, there could be more explicit articulation of how this historical and translational analysis adds to existing knowledge. While the paper discusses relevant literature, it could benefit from more explicitly outlining the unique insights gained from the historical and sociolinguistic framework employed, helping readers understand precisely where this research extends beyond prior scholarship.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, the author is generally explicit about the knowledge they are adding to the existing literature. They clearly state their intention to provide a sociolinguistic perspective on the evolution of LGBTQ terminology, particularly the transition from “gay” to “queer.” They emphasize the role of language in LGBTQ activism and identity formation, which is a valuable contribution to the field. The paper also highlights specific historical and linguistic contexts, shedding light on how these terms were adopted, adapted, and disseminated in different cultures and languages. However, while the paper presents a comprehensive analysis of LGBTQ terminology, there are moments when the author could be more explicit about the specific gaps or limitations they are addressing in the existing literature. Providing a more detailed discussion of what is missing or underrepresented in previous research could strengthen their argument about the novelty and significance of their contribution. Nonetheless, the paper does make a clear effort to identify its place within the existing body of knowledge on the subject.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** While the author does attempt to be explicit about the knowledge they are contributing, there are areas where this could be more clearly articulated. The paper delves into the historical development of the term “gay” in various languages and its implications for LGBTQ+ communities, which is undoubtedly valuable. However, the paper lacks a well-defined research question or hypothesis that would have clarified the specific knowledge gap being addressed. The author could have been more explicit in stating the precise contributions of their research in terms of advancing our understanding of language, translation, and LGBTQ+ identity. Additionally, the paper could benefit from a more critical engagement with existing literature and a clearer delineation of its unique insights in relation to prior scholarship. While it presents interesting historical data, it could be more explicit about the implications of this data for our broader understanding of language evolution and LGBTQ+ terminology adoption.

**ChatGPT 4:** The author implicitly contributes to existing knowledge by providing a nuanced examination of the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies across languages and cultures. However, the author could be more explicit in articulating the specific advancements made beyond existing research. While there are references to previous works and the author offers a detailed case study, a clearer delineation of the paper’s novel contributions would bolster its position within the academic discourse. Critical engagement with the text suggests that the author assumes a level of familiarity with the current state of research that the reader may not possess. This assumption could lead to ambiguities about the paper’s originality. Explicitly stating how this research fills gaps in the literature, challenges established theories, or applies new methodologies would significantly enhance the reader’s understanding of the unique contributions of this study. Without such explicit statements, the reader is left to infer the incremental knowledge added, which can undermine the perceived value of the research and its implications for the field.

# 1.3. Is it clear what the reported research is founded on?

**REVIEW 1:** The reported research is founded on a clear basis. The paper does provide a strong foundation by addressing the historical and sociopragmatic context of linguistic innovations within LGBTIQ+-related terminology, discussing how translation and language contact have played a crucial role in shaping these lexical developments, especially in the twentieth century. However, once again, more explicit references to existing scholarly literature that informs and supports the research must be provided. Indeed, while the paper does discuss the historical and sociopragmatic context of LGBTIQ+-related terminology and the role of translation, it would benefit from citing relevant academic sources in these areas.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper generally provides a clear foundation for its reported research, drawing from a diverse range of sources, including historical documents, linguistic data, and existing literature. It is evident that the research is grounded in an extensive examination of primary and secondary materials, such as LGBTQ+ publications, dictionaries, and academic works. However, there are moments when the paper could benefit from more transparency regarding the specific methodologies used for data collection and analysis. Additionally, while the author cites numerous references, they could provide more in-depth discussions of how each source contributes to their argument, making it clearer how the reported research is firmly rooted in a comprehensive understanding of the field.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper does a satisfactory job of indicating the sources it draws upon for its research, but it could benefit from greater clarity and explicitness in some areas. While it references numerous scholarly works, historical documents, and linguistic materials, it doesn’t always explicitly state how the reported research adds to the existing body of knowledge in these fields. The paper could be more critical in explaining how its research contributes to or challenges current theories or perspectives in sociolinguistics and LGBTQ+ studies. It would be beneficial for the author to explicitly state the gaps or limitations in existing research that their work aims to address. While the paper provides a solid foundation, it could improve its transparency by clearly delineating the specific contributions and insights that the research presented in the paper brings to the table. A more explicit connection between the existing knowledge base and the new findings would enhance the paper’s overall impact and make its contributions more evident to readers.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The clarity regarding the foundation of the reported research in the paper could be improved. While the author does make reference to various sources and historical texts, there is a lack of explicit clarity in certain sections about how the reported research is built upon prior scholarship or existing knowledge. In some parts of the text, the author mentions the relevance of historical events and documents, such as the Stonewall riots, Donald Webster Cory’s book, and the use of the term “gay” in different languages. However, there is limited engagement with the broader academic literature on these topics. The paper would benefit from more explicit citations and discussions of relevant scholarly works that form the foundation for the author’s research. Furthermore, the paper occasionally lacks in-depth analysis and critical engagement with the existing literature. While it briefly mentions certain historical and linguistic contexts, there is room for a more comprehensive exploration of prior research to contextualize the author’s findings. To enhance the clarity of the paper’s foundation, the author should consider providing a more detailed literature review, explicitly citing relevant academic sources, and demonstrating a deeper understanding of the existing knowledge in the field. This would help readers better understand the basis upon which the reported research is built and how it contributes to the broader academic discourse.

**ChatGPT 4:** The research appears to be founded on a combination of lexicographical analysis, translation studies, and historical sociolinguistics. The author references various academic sources and historical instances of LGBTQ terminology in use, which suggests a solid foundation in existing scholarship. However, the explicit theoretical underpinnings or methodological grounding are not distinctly articulated. For instance, while the author frequently cites Lo Vecchio, the reader is left to infer the exact nature of this foundational work’s influence on the current study. A more critical reading would expect the author to clearly outline the theoretical framework and methodological approaches that inform the research. The reader should be able to discern whether the study is based on a constructivist approach, focusing on language as a socially constructed phenomenon, or if it employs a more empirical method, analyzing the frequency and patterns of term usage across texts and contexts. Additionally, clarity on whether the research draws from qualitative analysis of texts, quantitative data, or a mixed-methods approach would be beneficial. In scholarly research, it is imperative for the author to elucidate the methodological and theoretical foundations to allow for critical evaluation and replication of the study. As it stands, while the author provides an insightful exploration of the topic, a clearer exposition of the research foundations would enhance the paper’s academic rigor.

# 1.4. Is there enough reference to the relevant literature?

**REVIEW 1:** See previous comments.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper demonstrates a substantial reference to relevant literature throughout its three parts. It effectively engages with a wide range of scholarly works, historical documents, and linguistic sources related to LGBTQ+ studies, queer theory, sociolinguistics, and translation studies. The author consistently incorporates citations from various disciplines, enriching the paper’s context and supporting their arguments. However, while the paper is well-referenced, there are instances where more in-depth discussions of the relevant literature could enhance the reader’s understanding. Providing detailed analyses or critiques of select key texts or theories within LGBTQ+ and translation studies might strengthen the paper’s scholarly foundation and offer deeper insights into the research’s contributions.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper includes a substantial number of references to relevant literature, which is a commendable aspect of the research. It effectively incorporates historical documents, linguistic studies, and scholarly works related to LGBTQ+ language, sociolinguistics, and translation practices. However, the extent to which it references the literature could still be considered somewhat uneven. While it covers a broad range of sources, there might be opportunities for the author to provide more comprehensive coverage of recent developments in the field. Additionally, in some sections, the paper could benefit from more explicit engagement with specific authors or theories that are highly relevant to the topic. Overall, while the paper does include a substantial number of references, a more balanced and detailed integration of the relevant literature could further strengthen its foundation and provide readers with a more comprehensive understanding of the research context.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** No, there is insufficient reference to the relevant literature in the paper. While the author touches upon historical events, translations, and linguistic adaptations, there is a notable lack of engagement with the broader academic literature in the field of translation studies, linguistics, and queer studies. The paper would benefit greatly from a more comprehensive review of the existing literature, which could serve to contextualize the author’s research and provide a foundation for their arguments. Specifically, there is a need for more extensive citations of relevant scholarly works that discuss translation strategies, the evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology, and the sociolinguistic aspects of language adaptation. Additionally, the paper should incorporate theoretical frameworks and concepts from translation studies and linguistics to support the author’s analysis. Concepts such as semantic calquing, lexical borrowing, and translational context should be introduced and linked to the author’s examination of the translations of LGBTQ+ terminology. By referencing the relevant literature more extensively, the paper would demonstrate a stronger grounding in existing research and provide readers with a broader perspective on the subject matter. This would enhance the overall academic rigor and depth of the paper.

**ChatGPT 4:** The paper makes an earnest effort to situate its research within the existing body of work on the translation and cultural adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies. However, there is room for improvement in terms of referencing relevant literature more extensively. To bolster its arguments and enhance its scholarly rigor, the paper should aim to incorporate a wider array of sources, including recent empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, and comparative analyses from diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. This would not only validate the research findings by situating them within a broader academic dialogue but also highlight the paper’s contribution to filling gaps in the current understanding of sociolinguistic and translation practices within LGBTQ communities. Moreover, engaging with a more diverse set of literature could provide additional insights into the complexities and nuances of translating LGBTQ terminologies, offering perspectives from different disciplines such as gender studies, cultural studies, and applied linguistics. This interdisciplinary approach would enrich the paper’s analysis, offering readers a more rounded understanding of the challenges and considerations involved in the translation process. By demonstrating a comprehensive engagement with both foundational texts and cutting-edge research, the paper could more convincingly articulate its place within the ongoing scholarly conversation on language, identity, and translation.

# 1.5. Is the author’s line of reasoning explicit?

**REVIEW 1:** The reasoning is supported by concrete examples and references to specific texts, both in English and other languages, which helps make the argument explicit and comprehensible. However, while the text is generally well-structured, there are some areas where further elaboration and contextualisation could enhance the clarity of the author’s argument. This includes providing additional background information and explaining the significance of the evidence presented. This can help readers more easily follow the author’s line of reasoning and understand the significance of the analysis presented in the text. For instance, the author of the paper abruptly introduces Cory’s case study without prior reference or context. The book is not briefly described, nor is the historical context in which it was written explained. Consequently, the examples provided seem detached from the original historical dimension, making them challenging to interpret. The author of the paper should therefore consider revising the analysis to provide clearer contextualisation of the information presented. This would help readers better understand the significance of the analysis and its relevance to the broader framework of the study.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author’s line of reasoning is mostly explicit, but there are moments where the paper could benefit from a more critical and nuanced exploration of the concepts presented. While the three parts of the paper are well-structured, the transition between Part 2 and Part 3 could be more seamless to ensure the reader follows the author’s train of thought effectively. Additionally, some sections would benefit from deeper analysis and more critical engagement with the sources and concepts introduced. While the paper provides a comprehensive overview of the historical and linguistic aspects of the LGBTQ+ lexicon, there are opportunities to delve further into the implications and consequences of linguistic choices and their impact on the LGBTQ+ community. In conclusion, while the paper’s line of reasoning is generally clear, a more critical examination of certain aspects could enhance its depth and impact.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author’s line of reasoning in the paper is largely explicit and well-structured. The paper follows a logical sequence, moving from historical events to linguistic developments and translation practices related to LGBTQ+ terminology. The author provides a clear overview of the chronological and thematic progression of the topic. However, there are moments when the paper could benefit from more explicit signposting of its argumentative structure. Some sections contain complex ideas and transitions that might require further clarification for readers who are not deeply familiar with the subject matter. Overall, while the paper maintains a clear and coherent line of reasoning, enhancing the explicitness of the argument’s structure in certain parts could further improve its accessibility and comprehension for a broader audience.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author’s line of reasoning in the paper is somewhat explicit but could benefit from further clarity and organization. While the paper presents a thorough examination of the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ+ terminology, there are moments when the argument becomes somewhat convoluted and might benefit from more explicit structuring. To improve the clarity of the author’s line of reasoning, they could consider the following:

* Clearer Organization: The paper could benefit from a more structured and explicitly stated outline or roadmap at the beginning. This would help readers understand the flow of the argument and how each section or point contributes to the overall thesis.
* Explicit Signposting: The author should use clear transitions and signposts to guide readers through the argument. This includes using phrases like “In this section, I will discuss...” or “To summarize...” to make the logical progression of ideas more explicit.
* Avoiding Tangential Points: While exploring various examples and historical contexts is valuable, the author should ensure that each point directly contributes to the central argument. Some sections of the paper may veer into tangential discussions that could be streamlined or omitted for clarity.
* Summarizing Key Points: At the end of each section or subsection, the author could provide concise summaries or key takeaways to reinforce the main arguments made in that section.

Overall, while the author’s reasoning is evident in the paper, enhancing the organization, signposting, and focus on central arguments could make the line of reasoning even more explicit and accessible to readers.

**ChatGPT 4:** The author’s line of reasoning, which connects the spread and adaptation of LGBTQ terminology to cultural, sociolinguistic, and translation processes, is discernible but not always explicit. The reader can follow the narrative thread that links historical events, such as the Stonewall riots, to changes in language use and translation choices. However, the author could further clarify the argument by explicitly stating the research questions or hypotheses guiding the study. Critical analysis would suggest that the reasoning could be made more transparent by outlining a clear progression from the initial premise through to the conclusions. For instance, while the author provides examples of how terms like “gay” and “queer” were adopted in different linguistic contexts, the rationale for focusing on these particular terms, the criteria for their selection, and how they specifically illustrate broader trends in language change could be more thoroughly explained. In academic research, an explicit line of reasoning is vital to guide the reader through the complexities of the argument and to underpin the validity of the conclusions drawn. The research would benefit from a more structured presentation of the argument, perhaps through a clearer introduction, signposting within the text, and a definitive conclusion that synthesizes the findings and explicitly ties them back to the initial line of inquiry.

# 1.6. Are there any flawed arguments?

**REVIEW 1:** There are no obvious flawed arguments. The author’s reasoning is generally sound and well-structured, and the claims made are supported by evidence from various examples. However, the authors should consider breaking down complex concepts into simpler language where possible, especially when introducing them. In particular, this is evident when using specialised terminology. Also, the author should consider breaking the analytical section text into smaller, clearly labelled subsections so as to make it easier for readers to navigate and understand the analysis. Finally, the concluding section of the paper seems to function more as an extension of the analysis rather than a comprehensive conclusion. To improve it, the author should consider incorporating the following elements:

* provide contextualisation for the study to solidify its place within the research space;
* summarise the main findings of the work and establish connections with existing literature;
* make explicit claims, offer explanations for the results, and compare the new findings with previous studies, potentially presenting alternative interpretations;
* highlight additional aspects or areas for future analysis related to the investigated phenomenon;
* address any remaining desiderata or unresolved questions.

These suggested elements should be included to enhance the clarity and completeness of the conclusion.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, there are some potential flaws in the arguments presented in the paper. One notable issue is the reliance on anecdotal evidence and selective examples to support broader claims about linguistic shifts and translations in the LGBTQ+ community. While the paper mentions specific cases and historical events, it lacks a comprehensive analysis of a wide range of linguistic data, which could strengthen its arguments and provide a more nuanced understanding of language change within this context. Additionally, the paper could benefit from a more critical examination of the methodology used for tracking lexical innovations and translations. It often assumes a direct causal relationship between extralinguistic events and linguistic changes without thoroughly exploring other possible factors that may have influenced language evolution. Furthermore, the paper could improve its clarity in connecting the historical context, linguistic developments, and the sociolinguistic implications of LGBTQ+ terminology. A more explicit and structured line of reasoning would help readers follow the author’s argumentation more effectively. In summary, while the paper offers valuable insights into the evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology, it could enhance its arguments by incorporating more comprehensive linguistic data, critically evaluating its methodology, and providing a clearer and more structured line of reasoning.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** There are no glaringly flawed arguments in the paper. However, there are areas where the author’s arguments could be further strengthened or elaborated upon. For example, when discussing the adoption of the term “queer” internationally in the early to mid-1990s, the author mentions the role of translation but does not provide specific examples or detailed analysis of how this translation process took place in different linguistic and cultural contexts. Providing concrete case studies or examples of translation practices could enhance the argument and make it more compelling. Additionally, in some sections, the paper relies on references to other works without always clearly demonstrating how these references support the author’s own arguments. It would be beneficial to provide more explicit connections between the referenced literature and the author’s analysis to strengthen the overall argument. While there are no major flawed arguments, the paper could benefit from further elaboration and clarification in certain areas to enhance its overall coherence and persuasiveness.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, there are several instances of flawed arguments in the paper. One notable issue is the overemphasis on linguistic factors to explain the adoption and adaptation of LGBTQ+ terminology across languages. While linguistic analysis is undoubtedly crucial, it is not the sole determinant of how these terms evolve and gain acceptance. The paper could benefit from a more holistic approach that considers sociocultural and historical contexts, as language usage is deeply intertwined with broader societal changes. Another concern is the occasional lack of clarity in the paper’s statements. For example, when discussing the translation of “gay” into French, the concept of “othering framing” is introduced without clear definitions or concrete examples. This ambiguity leaves readers grappling with the precise meaning and significance of the term within the context of the paper. Additionally, the paper would benefit from addressing counterarguments or alternative perspectives. While it presents compelling arguments in favor of its thesis, acknowledging opposing viewpoints and either refuting or integrating them into the discussion would enhance the overall balance and persuasiveness of the analysis. Lastly, the organization of ideas within the paper could be improved to create a more coherent and logical flow of arguments. Some sections appear disjointed, making it challenging for readers to follow the paper’s progression. By restructuring and providing clearer signposts between sections, the paper could enhance its overall readability and effectiveness. In conclusion, while the paper offers valuable insights, these flawed arguments hinder its full potential. Addressing these issues would strengthen the paper’s quality and make it a more compelling and rigorous contribution to the field.

**ChatGPT 4:** Upon critical review, there are areas within the paper where the arguments could be considered less robust or potentially flawed, primarily due to the lack of explicit methodological detail and the broad generalizations made from specific case studies. While the author provides insightful observations on the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies, these discussions occasionally rest on assumptions or interpretations that may not be universally applicable or sufficiently supported by empirical data. One potential flaw is the implicit assumption that the processes and challenges involved in translating terms like “GAY” and “QUEER” into different languages are similar across cultural contexts. This overlooks the nuanced and complex socio-political landscapes that can significantly impact language use and change. The author could strengthen the argument by incorporating a more diverse range of examples or by presenting counterexamples that challenge the primary narrative. Additionally, the reliance on specific texts and translations as representative of broader linguistic trends might not fully account for the variation and dynamism inherent in language use, especially within diverse LGBTQ communities. This approach risks oversimplifying the multifaceted ways in which terms are adopted, adapted, and resisted in different cultures. Finally, while the paper aims to link translation practices with sociolinguistic change, it occasionally conflates correlation with causation. The assertion that translation acts as a primary driver of language change in the context of LGBTQ terminologies would benefit from a more nuanced examination of the interplay between translation, media, activism, and societal attitudes. Addressing these potential flaws by providing clearer methodological details, considering a wider range of examples, and carefully distinguishing between correlation and causation would enhance the strength and validity of the author’s arguments.

# 1.7. Are the examples adduced relevant? Are they interpreted correctly?

**REVIEW 1:** The examples provided in the text are relevant to the topic of the paper, and they help illustrate various points related to the translation of LGBTIQ+ terminology. The author uses these examples to support their arguments and demonstrate the cross-cultural adoption of the term ‘gay’. However, the author should consider the previous comments provided in this report to improve the clarity of the interpretation of specific phenomena.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper generally provides relevant examples to support its arguments, especially when discussing the historical development of LGBTQ+ terminology and its translation across languages. However, there are instances where the interpretation of examples could be more thorough and nuanced. For instance, the paper cites historical figures and their contributions to LGBTQ+ language, such as Jack Argo and Donald Webster Cory. While these examples are indeed relevant, the paper could delve deeper into the linguistic impact of their work, how it was received within the community, and its long-term implications for language evolution. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the role these individuals played in shaping LGBTQ+ terminology. In terms of translations, the paper mentions the adaptation of the term “queer” into various languages. While it highlights the translational aspects, a more detailed analysis of how these translations capture the nuances and cultural connotations of the term “queer” would enhance the paper’s depth. Overall, the examples are relevant to the paper’s overarching themes, but there is room for a more in-depth interpretation of their linguistic and sociocultural significance.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper generally provides relevant examples to support its arguments. It draws upon historical and contemporary instances of the adoption and adaptation of LGBTQ+ terminology, such as the use of “gay” and “queer,” as well as specific translations of key texts and terms. These examples help illustrate the author’s points about the dynamic nature of language and the role of translation in LGBTQ+ activism. However, there are instances where the paper could benefit from more detailed analysis and interpretation of the examples. For instance, when discussing the translation of “queer” into different languages, the paper mentions terms like “transpédégouine” and “transmaricabollo” in French and Spanish, respectively. While these examples are relevant, the paper does not delve deeply into their cultural and linguistic nuances or provide a thorough interpretation of how they contribute to the evolution of LGBTQ+ language. Providing more in-depth analysis of these examples would enhance the paper’s overall quality. In summary, the examples in the paper are generally relevant, but there is room for more detailed interpretation and analysis of these examples to strengthen the argument further.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The examples provided in the paper are relevant in the context of discussing the translational choices and adaptations of LGBTQ+ terminology in different languages. They illustrate how terms like “gay” were introduced and used in various languages, shedding light on the complexities of translation and linguistic adaptation in LGBTQ+ discourse. The inclusion of examples from Donald Webster Cory’s book and its translations, as well as references to other multilingual sources like Der Kreis/Le Cercle, adds depth to the analysis and demonstrates the international dissemination of these terms. However, while the examples are relevant, their interpretation could benefit from more detailed analysis. Some examples, such as the use of “gay” in French and German texts, are briefly mentioned without a thorough exploration of the linguistic and cultural nuances behind their adoption. Providing deeper insights into the specific sociolinguistic contexts in which these terms emerged and evolved would enhance the paper’s overall argument. In summary, the examples presented are pertinent to the paper’s subject matter, but a more in-depth interpretation of each example, considering linguistic, cultural, and historical factors, would strengthen the analysis and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the translational choices made.

**ChatGPT 4:** The examples provided in the paper are highly relevant to the discussion of how LGBTQ terminology has been translated and adapted across languages and cultures. These examples serve as concrete illustrations of the paper’s broader themes, such as the sociolinguistic processes involved in lexical innovation and the impact of cultural and activist contexts on language change. The choice to focus on terms like “GAY,” “QUEER,” and “BISEXUAL” and their translations into languages such as Spanish, French, and German offers valuable insights into the complex dynamics of language contact and change within the LGBTQ community. However, the interpretation of these examples could be scrutinized for potential oversimplification or bias. While the author connects these examples to trends in sociolinguistic change and the role of translation in spreading LGBTQ terminologies, there is a risk of attributing too much agency to specific translations or individuals without adequately considering the broader socio-historical context. For instance, the interpretation of “alegre” as a semantic calque for “gay” in Spanish translations or the adoption of “gay” itself as a term within various linguistic communities might not fully account for the diverse factors influencing these processes, including resistance to or acceptance of LGBTQ identities. Moreover, the paper’s reliance on specific case studies and texts as illustrative of wider trends necessitates careful analysis to ensure these examples are not being used to make generalized conclusions that might not hold in other contexts or time periods. While the examples are indeed relevant, their interpretation would benefit from a more nuanced consideration of the limitations and potential variability in how LGBTQ terminologies are understood and employed across different cultures and languages. In summary, while the examples adduced are pertinent and effectively highlight key issues in the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminology, a more critical examination of their interpretation could enhance the paper’s analytical depth and avoid potential oversights in understanding the complex interplay between language, culture, and identity.

# Review 2

# 2.a. Does the paper present original research? Is the author explicit about what knowledge s/he is adding to the knowledge already presented elsewhere? Is it clear what the reported research is founded on? Is there enough reference to the relevant literature?

**REVIEW 2:** The paper titled “Translation as a tool for lexicology: A case study of *gay*” can be situated in the field of translation and lexicographic studies, exploring the use of translation analysis as a valuable tool in historical comparative lexicology, with a specific focus on the cross-cultural transfer of LGBTIQ+-related terminology between languages. More specifically, the study examines the neologistic processes involved in the spread of the word ‘gay’ (but it also focuses on others) across different linguistic and cultural contexts, mapping its transfer over time from English to Spanish, French, and German. The analysis highlights the role of translation in establishing concrete chronologies and geographies of cultural contact, offering insights into the evolution of LGBTIQ+ lexicon beyond language-internal innovations. In this way, the broader aim of the investigation is to contribute to a diachronic lexicological understanding of the origin and spread of lexical terms in LGBTIQ+ discourse. In so doing, the paper presents original research. However, the paper does not provide a complete account of previous research done in this context. The work carried out (among others) by Paul Baker, for instance, in the study of LGBTIQ+-related terms is missing from the paper. Also, the sociolinguistic dimension of the study background is somehow lacking. Indeed, the author underlines how important it is to focus on language practice and change, and cites the connection between mediated discourse and sociolinguistic change. However, this dimension is not fully explored neither in the literature review nor in the analysis of the case study taken into consideration.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper does present original research, mainly in the form of an in-depth exploration of LGBTQ+ terminology and its historical evolution. While it offers a comprehensive analysis of linguistic and translational aspects, it could provide greater clarity regarding its original contributions to the existing body of knowledge. The author successfully draws on a wide array of linguistic sources and historical texts to establish a foundation for the research, but some aspects of the research’s foundation may benefit from more explicit detail. Additionally, while the paper references a substantial amount of relevant literature, there might be room for deeper engagement with contemporary scholarship in the ever-evolving field of LGBTQ+ linguistics. Overall, while the paper contributes to the field, there is potential for greater emphasis on its originality and a more comprehensive review of the existing literature.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper presents original research in the field of linguistics, particularly in the context of LGBTQ+ terminology and its translation. The author is explicit about their contribution, emphasizing the study’s focus on the historical development of LGBTQ+ terminology across languages, especially in the post-Stonewall era. They provide a detailed examination of lexical innovations and their sociolinguistic implications. However, while the paper offers valuable insights into the linguistic aspects of LGBTQ+ terminology, it could benefit from a more explicit connection to broader sociocultural and political contexts, helping readers understand the societal implications of the linguistic changes discussed. The reported research is founded on an extensive analysis of LGBTQ+ terminology, drawing from various sources, including historical documents, activist writings, and multilingual publications. The author effectively incorporates these sources to trace the evolution of LGBTQ+ language, especially in Italy and France. However, there is a need for clearer delineation of methodological approaches employed, such as corpus analysis or discourse analysis, to enhance the paper’s academic rigor. The paper does reference relevant literature in the field of LGBTQ+ studies and translation studies, which adds credibility to the research. Nevertheless, it could benefit from more explicit engagement with contemporary theoretical frameworks and debates in sociolinguistics, as well as more direct comparisons with existing scholarship on LGBTQ+ terminology. In summary, the paper presents original research on LGBTQ+ terminology, but it could strengthen its connections to broader societal contexts, provide clearer methodological insights, and engage more directly with contemporary literature in sociolinguistics and LGBTQ+ studies to enhance its overall impact and contribution.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** In evaluating the paper’s originality and contribution to existing knowledge, it’s evident that the research primarily relies on an extensive review and analysis of existing literature, translations, and historical texts. While the author provides a comprehensive overview of the topic, the paper’s originality might be questioned from a certain perspective. The study could benefit from more explicitly outlining how it adds new knowledge to the field of translation studies or linguistics. While it delves into the historical evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology, it could articulate its novel contributions more explicitly to demonstrate its unique value. The paper’s foundation is built upon a thorough examination of historical texts, translations, and linguistic analysis. It provides an informative historical context for the evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology, but it lacks a detailed discussion of the specific research methods and analytical frameworks employed. Offering greater transparency about the research methodology would enhance the clarity of the paper’s foundations and strengthen its overall academic rigor. In terms of referencing relevant literature, the paper makes an effort to cite a wide array of sources related to LGBTQ+ terminology and translation. However, one could argue that the paper leans heavily on historical references and may not sufficiently incorporate more recent scholarship. Ensuring a more balanced inclusion of contemporary studies and discussions on LGBTQ+ translation and language adaptation would bolster the paper’s relevance and ensure it engages with the latest academic discourse effectively. In summary, while the paper offers a valuable historical perspective on LGBTQ+ terminology and translation, it could improve its originality by explicitly stating its contributions, provide greater clarity about its research methodology, and incorporate a more balanced selection of both historical and contemporary literature to ensure it aligns with current academic discourse in the field.

**ChatGPT 4:** The paper does indeed present a form of original research by delving into the nuanced process of translating LGBTQ terminologies across languages, which is a relatively underexplored area in the intersection of sociolinguistics and queer studies. The author, however, could have been more explicit in delineating the novel contributions of their work against the backdrop of existing literature. While the paper draws on previous studies, including the pivotal work of Donald Webster Cory, a more thorough engagement with a broader spectrum of relevant literature could have strengthened the argument, highlighting the unique insights the current research offers. The foundational basis of the reported research, primarily rooted in translation studies and sociolinguistics, is evident but would benefit from a clearer articulation of the theoretical and methodological frameworks employed. This approach would not only solidify the research’s originality but also enhance its scholarly rigor. Moreover, increasing the breadth of referenced literature, particularly recent studies that address similar themes, would provide a more comprehensive context for the research, demonstrating a deeper engagement with the field and reinforcing the significance of the author’s contributions.

# 2.b. Is the author’s line of reasoning explicit? Are there any flawed arguments? Are the examples adduced relevant? Are they interpreted correctly?

**REVIEW 2:** The author’s line of reasoning occasionally proves challenging to track. The progression of introduced topics lacks linearity and can be abrupt at times. In this sense, the paper gives the impression of being a condensed version of a more extensive work, where transition paragraphs may have been omitted, making it challenging for readers to seamlessly follow the presented arguments. Additionally, the sudden introduction of the case study without prior mention and, more significantly, without a comprehensive background creates difficulty in grasping the observations provided. While the author supports their analysis with various examples, enhancing the discussion with background information on the case study would aid readers in better comprehending the insights derived from the analysis.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author’s line of reasoning in the paper is generally explicit, offering a clear structure and logical progression in presenting the historical development of LGBTQ+ terminology. However, there are moments where the argumentation could benefit from additional clarity, especially in connecting the historical context to the linguistic changes discussed. Some arguments might require more elaboration to ensure that readers fully grasp their significance. Additionally, while the examples provided are relevant and largely interpreted correctly, there are instances where a deeper analysis of the context and implications of certain terms and translational practices would strengthen the arguments. It’s important to maintain rigor in analyzing the examples, especially when dealing with nuanced and sensitive topics like LGBTQ+ terminology. Overall, while the line of reasoning is discernible, the paper could enhance its clarity and depth in certain aspects of argumentation and interpretation.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author’s line of reasoning in the paper is generally explicit, with a clear progression from the historical context of LGBTQ+ terminology to its translation and evolution across languages. However, there are moments when the paper’s argumentation could benefit from more explicit signposting of key points and transitions between sections to improve overall coherence. Regarding flawed arguments, there are no major logical fallacies or flawed arguments apparent in the paper. However, there are instances where the connections between linguistic developments and broader sociocultural implications could be more explicitly articulated. For example, the paper discusses the adoption of the term “queer” and its various translations but could delve deeper into why this linguistic choice matters in the context of LGBTQ+ activism and identity politics. The examples provided in the paper are generally relevant and illustrative of the author’s points. They effectively demonstrate the linguistic changes and adaptations within the LGBTQ+ terminology, especially in the context of translation. However, there could be more explicit links between these examples and the paper’s overarching argument. Additionally, some examples might benefit from more detailed analysis to ensure a comprehensive understanding of their significance. Overall, the author’s line of reasoning is clear, and there are no glaringly flawed arguments in the paper. However, improving the explicit articulation of key points, strengthening the connections between linguistic developments and sociocultural contexts, and providing more detailed analysis of specific examples could enhance the paper’s overall effectiveness.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The author’s line of reasoning in the paper is generally explicit and logical. They provide a clear narrative of the historical evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology in different languages, tracing its origins and adaptations over time. However, there are instances where the arguments could be further elaborated to enhance clarity. For example, when discussing the adoption of the term “gay” in different languages, the paper could delve deeper into the socio-cultural contexts that facilitated or hindered this adaptation, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the linguistic choices made by translators and communities. While the overall reasoning is sound, there are occasional instances of flawed arguments. For instance, the paper mentions the absence of genetically related terms like “gai” or “gayo” in certain translations, but it doesn’t fully explore the reasons behind this absence. Further analysis could have revealed whether these terms were deliberately avoided or if there were other linguistic factors at play. Additionally, the paper occasionally assumes causality in the adoption of LGBTQ+ terminology without providing concrete evidence. A more nuanced examination of these assumptions would strengthen the arguments. The examples provided in the paper are generally relevant to the discussion, offering insights into how LGBTQ+ terminology was translated and adapted in different linguistic contexts. However, there are moments where the interpretation of examples could benefit from additional contextual information. For instance, when discussing the use of “gay” in the French translation “bar spécial,” the paper could explore the nuances of this choice in the context of French LGBTQ+ culture during that period. This would help ensure a more comprehensive interpretation of the examples. In summary, the author’s line of reasoning is explicit, but there are occasional flawed arguments that could benefit from deeper analysis and nuance. The examples provided are relevant but could be interpreted more comprehensively with additional contextual information.

**ChatGPT 4:** The author’s line of reasoning, while grounded in an intriguing premise, could be articulated with greater clarity to enhance the paper’s logical flow. The journey from the historical context of LGBTQ terminology through to the nuances of translation across different cultures presents a complex narrative that occasionally meanders without clear signposting. This sometimes makes it challenging for the reader to follow the core argument or understand the progression of ideas. Regarding flawed arguments, the paper might occasionally lean on assumptions about the universality of certain LGBTQ terms without fully considering cultural or linguistic nuances that could affect their translation and reception. This oversight could lead to overgeneralizations that don’t account for the diversity within LGBTQ communities and experiences across different societies. The examples chosen to illustrate the process of translating LGBTQ terminologies are indeed relevant and provide valuable insights into the subject. However, the interpretation of these examples occasionally misses an opportunity to deeply explore how cultural contexts significantly influence the adoption and adaptation of these terms. A more critical examination of the examples, including potential misinterpretations or controversies surrounding these translations, would not only strengthen the paper’s argument but also provide a richer, more nuanced understanding of the complexities involved in translating LGBTQ terminologies across languages and cultures.

# 2.c. Are there any important omissions?

**REVIEW 2:** As previously highlighted, the paper could gain substantial value from an expanded literature review and, notably, a more robust sociolinguistic approach to the presented case study. While the author acknowledges the significance of this dimension, it remains largely unexplored, and if connections are drawn to the sociological aspect of the case study, they appear tenuous and inadequately developed. Moreover, the methodological framework lacks clear discussion, and the author should provide a more explicit presentation of it. In other words, a more direct and identifiable articulation of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings would enhance the overall clarity and coherence of the paper. Readers would indeed benefit from a deeper understanding of it, contributing to the study’s broader implications. Additionally, a thorough discussion of the methodological framework is crucial for readers to evaluate the validity and reliability of the research findings. By addressing these aspects, the paper can establish a more solid foundation, ensuring that both the theoretical framework and methodological approach are transparent and accessible.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper, while comprehensive in its exploration of LGBTQ+ terminology and translational practices, does have some notable omissions. Firstly, it could benefit from a more extensive discussion of the intersectionality within LGBTQ+ communities and how this complexity is reflected in language use. Addressing the diverse experiences and linguistic nuances related to gender identity, race, and ethnicity would provide a more holistic understanding of the subject matter. Secondly, the paper primarily focuses on Western perspectives and experiences, with limited coverage of LGBTQ+ terminology and translational practices in non-Western contexts. Including a more global perspective would enrich the analysis and offer a broader view of how these terms evolve and translate across cultures. Lastly, there could be more exploration of the role of digital media and technology in shaping contemporary LGBTQ+ terminology and its dissemination. The impact of social media, online communities, and dating apps on language use and identity expression is a significant aspect that warrants further examination. In summary, the paper contains important omissions related to intersectionality, non-Western perspectives, and the influence of digital media, which, if addressed, would enhance its comprehensiveness and relevance.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, there are some notable omissions in the paper. Firstly, while the paper extensively discusses the adoption and translation of the term “queer,” it doesn’t engage deeply with the critiques and debates surrounding this term within the LGBTQ+ community. Authors like Judith Butler and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, who have made significant contributions to queer theory and its linguistic implications, are only mentioned briefly. A more thorough exploration of these scholars’ work and their impact on the terminology could provide valuable insights. Additionally, the paper doesn’t delve into the intersectionality of LGBTQ+ identities and terminology. It focuses primarily on the linguistic aspects of gay and queer, but there’s limited discussion about how terminology has evolved for other identities within the LGBTQ+ spectrum, such as transgender or non-binary individuals. Authors like Susan Stryker and Jack Halberstam, who have explored these intersections, could have been referenced. Furthermore, the paper lacks engagement with the perspectives of LGBTQ+ communities outside of Western contexts. While it briefly mentions translations into Spanish and Italian, there’s a missed opportunity to explore the linguistic developments and sociocultural implications of LGBTQ+ terminology in non-Western regions. Scholars like Kamala Kempadoo, who have examined LGBTQ+ issues in the Global South, could have been included to provide a more comprehensive perspective. In summary, the paper could benefit from addressing important omissions related to critical scholars in the field, intersectionality within LGBTQ+ terminology, and non-Western LGBTQ+ communities’ experiences with language and identity.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, there are some notable omissions in the paper. While the paper provides a comprehensive historical overview of LGBTQ+ terminology and its translation in different languages, there are certain aspects that could have been explored further. One significant omission is the lack of in-depth analysis of the socio-political factors that influenced the adoption and adaptation of LGBTQ+ terminology in various countries. Understanding how legal frameworks, societal attitudes, and activism played a role in shaping these linguistic choices would have enriched the discussion. Additionally, the paper could have delved deeper into the role of gender and gender-neutral language in LGBTQ+ terminology. The omission of such discussions leaves a gap in our understanding of how gender identity and expression were considered in translation practices. Furthermore, the paper primarily focuses on Western languages and cultures, with limited exploration of LGBTQ+ terminology in non-Western contexts. Including more diverse perspectives and examples from non-Western languages would have provided a more global and inclusive view of the topic. In summary, while the paper offers valuable insights into LGBTQ+ terminology translation, there are important omissions related to the socio-political context, gender considerations, and non-Western perspectives that could have enhanced the comprehensiveness of the research.

**ChatGPT 4:** An important omission in the paper is the lack of a detailed discussion on the role of digital media and online communities in the contemporary evolution and dissemination of LGBTQ terminologies. In an era where digital platforms significantly influence language and identity politics, the paper misses an opportunity to explore how these technologies facilitate rapid cross-cultural exchanges and potentially alter the translation dynamics of LGBTQ terms. This oversight is notable, given the transformative impact of social media on the visibility and activism of LGBTQ communities globally. Additionally, the paper could have benefited from incorporating perspectives on intersectionality, especially how factors such as race, ethnicity, and socio-economic status intersect with sexual orientation and gender identity in the context of language use and translation. By not fully addressing these dimensions, the research overlooks the complex realities that shape the lived experiences of LGBTQ individuals in different cultural settings. Furthermore, the analysis would have been enriched by a more explicit consideration of the methodologies used for translation studies within the LGBTQ context. A discussion on the challenges and ethical considerations translators face, especially when dealing with culturally sensitive terms, would provide deeper insights into the nuances of the translation process. Addressing these omissions could significantly broaden the scope of the paper, offering a more comprehensive and contemporary examination of the issues surrounding the translation and globalization of LGBTQ terminologies.

**ChatGPT 4:** In this revised perspective, the paper appears to comprehensively cover the core areas relevant to its research questions, effectively addressing the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies across different languages and cultural contexts. It navigates through historical, linguistic, and sociopolitical landscapes to offer a nuanced understanding of the subject matter. The inclusion of Donald Webster Cory’s seminal work as a focal point provides a solid foundation for exploring the complexities involved in translating LGBTQ terms, ensuring that the study is well-anchored in significant historical and cultural milestones. The paper thoughtfully incorporates a range of examples to illustrate the practical challenges and considerations in translating LGBTQ terminologies, thereby avoiding any glaring omissions in this aspect. By doing so, it successfully highlights the interplay between language, identity, and culture, offering insights into the nuances of linguistic adaptation in the context of LGBTQ communities. Furthermore, the author seems to have made a conscious effort to reference relevant literature, drawing from a variety of sources to support the analysis. This comprehensive approach ensures that the paper is well-situated within the broader scholarly conversation on language, translation, and LGBTQ studies, suggesting that there aren’t major omissions that would detract from the research’s value or integrity. Overall, the paper’s thorough exploration of its subject matter, combined with careful consideration of historical and contemporary sources, suggests that it effectively addresses the key dimensions of its research topic without significant omissions.

# 2.d. Is there any material which is superfluous in relation to the objectives of the paper?

**REVIEW 2:** No material introduced in the paper is extraneous concerning its objectives. However, it is advisable to expand on these points to enhance the comprehensibility of the analysis, thus bolstering the overall clarity of the analysis and also ensuring that the readers can fully grasp the relevance and implications of the presented information.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** There are instances of material in the paper that may be considered somewhat superfluous in relation to its main objectives. While the historical background and context provided in Part 1 are valuable for understanding the evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology, some sections delve into extensive biographical details of individuals not directly related to the central theme. For instance, the detailed biographical accounts of authors and activists, while interesting, could be streamlined to maintain a tighter focus on the linguistic and translational aspects. Additionally, some sections in Part 3, particularly those discussing specific translations and adaptations of LGBTQ+ terminology in various languages, may be overly detailed for readers seeking a broader sociolinguistic understanding. While these examples are informative, they could be condensed to make room for more comprehensive analysis or discussion of broader trends. Overall, while these sections may not align perfectly with the paper’s primary objectives, they still contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the topic. However, a more streamlined approach could improve the paper’s focus and readability.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** There doesn’t appear to be any superfluous material in the paper. The author has carefully chosen and presented information that is directly related to the paper’s objectives, focusing on linguistic developments related to white gay men in the United States and their impact on language change and social change. However, it’s essential to consider that what might seem superfluous to one reader may hold value for another, as the paper aims to provide a comprehensive historical overview.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Yes, there are instances of material in the paper that could be considered superfluous in relation to its objectives. For example, the extensive discussion of specific translations of LGBTQ+ terminology in languages other than Spanish, French, and German may be seen as tangential to the primary focus on the translation of “gay” in those languages. While providing a broader context can be informative, the paper could benefit from a more concise treatment of these additional translations, focusing primarily on the core languages of interest. Furthermore, some sections of the paper delve into historical linguistic developments and debates about LGBTQ+ terminology that, while interesting, do not directly contribute to the stated objectives of analyzing translation strategies. While background information is valuable, these sections could be streamlined to maintain a tighter focus on the primary research questions related to translation practices. In summary, while certain material in the paper may be considered informative, it could be perceived as superfluous in the context of the paper’s stated objectives. Streamlining these sections would help maintain a more focused and concise presentation of the research findings.

**ChatGPT 4:** Given the objectives of the paper, which focus on the translation and cultural adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies, most of the material appears to be directly relevant and contributes to building a comprehensive understanding of the topic. However, there could be instances where the detailed historical background on each terminology or the extensive biographical focus on Donald Webster Cory, while informative, might divert attention from the paper’s core analytical objectives. While these sections enrich the narrative by providing context, they could potentially be streamlined to maintain a sharper focus on the translation processes, challenges, and the sociolinguistic implications thereof. Additionally, if there are extensive digressions into areas not directly linked to the translation and adaptation of terms—such as broader historical events without a clear connection to the language use within LGBTQ communities—these might be considered superfluous. Streamlining such content would allow the paper to devote more space to directly analyzing translation strategies, the reception of translated terms in target cultures, and their impact on LGBTQ identity and activism. In essence, while the depth of background information and related discussions underscore the author’s thorough research and deep engagement with the subject, a more focused approach could enhance the clarity and impact of the paper, ensuring that all material directly advances the understanding of its stated objectives.

# 2.e. Are examples in less commonly known languages sufficiently and plausibly explained?

**REVIEW 2:** The author adeptly elucidates all examples from languages other than English, offering a comprehensive and persuasive explanation. The clear presentation of these examples serves to justify the insights derived from the contrastive analysis. However, to further enrich the reader’s understanding, the author could consider providing additional contextual information for each non-English example. This would not only strengthen the persuasiveness of the analysis but also ensure a more thorough comprehension of the various linguistic elements explored.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper generally provides adequate explanations for examples in less commonly known languages. However, there are instances where further clarification could enhance the reader’s understanding. In Part 3, when discussing the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ+ terminology in various languages, the paper could benefit from more detailed explanations for less commonly known languages, especially when introducing unique or complex terms. This would ensure that readers unfamiliar with these languages can fully grasp the linguistic nuances and cultural context surrounding these terms. Additionally, the paper might consider providing glossaries or footnotes for certain terms, particularly those in languages that use non-Latin scripts or characters. This would assist readers in pronouncing and understanding these terms accurately. Overall, while the explanations for examples in less commonly known languages are generally sufficient, more detailed clarifications and glossaries for specific terms would enhance the paper’s accessibility and comprehensibility to a wider audience.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper does a reasonably good job of explaining examples in less commonly known languages, particularly when discussing the translation of the term “queer” into various languages. However, there could be room for more detailed explanations in some instances. The author generally provides a sufficient context to understand the examples, but for readers unfamiliar with the languages or cultures in question, additional information or glosses could enhance comprehension. Additionally, while the paper acknowledges translation practices in various languages, a deeper exploration of non-Western languages and cultures could have been included to provide a more comprehensive view of the global adoption and adaptation of LGBTQ+ terminology.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper generally provides explanations for examples in less commonly known languages, but there are instances where further clarification could enhance comprehension. While the paper primarily focuses on Spanish, French, and German translations of “gay,” it briefly touches on translations in other languages. In these cases, the explanations are often brief, leaving room for ambiguity, especially for readers who may not be familiar with those languages. To improve clarity, the author could expand upon the explanations of translations in less commonly known languages. This could include providing additional context, linguistic nuances, or cultural factors that influence the choice of certain terms or expressions. Additionally, offering more specific examples and references for these languages would enhance the plausibility of the explanations. By providing more comprehensive and detailed explanations for translations in less commonly known languages, the paper can ensure that readers gain a thorough understanding of the linguistic and cultural considerations at play in these contexts. This would contribute to the overall effectiveness of the research.

**ChatGPT 4:** The paper makes an effort to incorporate examples from less commonly known languages, aiming to broaden the scope of its analysis beyond the more widely studied European languages. This inclusion is commendable for its attempt to diversify the linguistic and cultural perspectives on the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies. However, the explanation and analysis of these examples might not always reach the level of detail or plausibility that would fully illuminate the specific challenges and nuances associated with these languages. For these examples to contribute meaningfully to the paper’s objectives, they require a context that explains the linguistic, cultural, and sociopolitical background of each language area. This context is crucial for understanding why certain translation choices were made and how they reflect or influence the local LGBTQ communities’ identities and discourses. Without this, readers unfamiliar with these less commonly known languages may find it challenging to grasp the significance of the examples or to evaluate the plausibility of the author’s interpretations. Improving the paper could involve offering a more thorough explanation of the linguistic features of these languages, the cultural contexts in which LGBTQ terminologies are being negotiated, and the specific translation strategies employed. Additionally, providing insights into the reception of these terms within their respective communities would enhance the plausibility of the examples. Such enhancements would not only strengthen the paper’s analytical depth but also enrich the reader’s understanding of the complex dynamics of language and identity across diverse cultural landscapes.

# 2.f. Is the format of the paper appropriate and the writing style suitable for the intended readership?

**REVIEW 2:** The paper displays an appropriate format, and the writing style aligns well with academic standards. However, the author is encouraged to revise specific sections by providing more comprehensive information on certain concepts. In reading the paper, there is a recurring feeling that it has been summarized/condensed from a more extensive version, contributing to occasional gaps in clarity. For instance, the Introduction falls short in setting a clear scene for subsequent sections; it inadequately outlines the study’s objectives and overlooks any mention of the case study under investigation. Similarly, the section titled “Toward linguistic self-determination in the twentieth century” appears disjointed and would benefit from revision to strengthen the coherence of the presented information. Also, the section “Cory in translation: Cultural contact through a seminal gay text” lacks a sufficiently detailed background for the examined case study. Therefore, expanding these sections and providing a more robust foundation for the case study would greatly enhance the overall cohesion and reader comprehension. This can start by offering a clearer roadmap in the Introduction, and smoothing out transitions in the subsequent sections would contribute to a more seamless and engaging narrative.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The format of the paper is generally appropriate for an academic audience interested in sociolinguistics and linguistic studies related to LGBTQ+ terminology. It adheres to a structured format with distinct sections, making it easy for readers to follow the author’s arguments and analysis. However, the writing style may benefit from some adjustments to enhance clarity and readability. The paper contains complex language and specialized terminology, which is expected in academic discourse but might pose challenges for readers who are not experts in the field. To improve accessibility, the author could consider providing concise explanations or definitions of key terms and concepts within the text or in footnotes. Additionally, the paper could benefit from more explicit transitions between sections or ideas to guide the reader through the author’s line of reasoning. This would help readers follow the argument more easily. Overall, while the format is suitable for the intended readership, some adjustments in writing style and clarity could enhance the paper’s accessibility to a broader audience, including those new to the subject matter.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The format of the paper is generally appropriate for an academic audience interested in linguistics, sociolinguistics, and LGBTQ+ studies. It follows a standard academic paper structure with clear headings, citations, and references. The writing style is formal and academic, which is suitable for the intended readership. However, there are moments when the writing could be more concise, and some sections are quite dense and detailed, which may require a high level of engagement and background knowledge from readers. While this level of detail is essential for the thorough analysis presented in the paper, it might make it less accessible to a broader readership or those not well-versed in the specific field. Overall, the format and writing style are appropriate for the academic context, but the paper could benefit from occasional simplification or clarification to make it more accessible to a wider range of readers.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper’s format and writing style are generally appropriate for its intended readership, which appears to be scholars and researchers in the fields of linguistics, translation studies, and LGBTQ+ studies. The paper follows a structured and academic format with clear sections and citations, which is customary for scholarly articles. The writing style is formal and academic, which is expected in this context. However, it’s worth noting that the paper’s content is highly specialized and may require a certain level of background knowledge in linguistics and translation studies to fully understand and appreciate. Some readers who are not well-versed in these fields may find certain sections of the paper challenging to follow due to its technical terminology and linguistic concepts. Therefore, while the format and writing style align with academic norms, the accessibility of the content to a broader readership could be a consideration.

**ChatGPT 4:** The format of the paper and its writing style are generally suitable for its academic audience, adhering to scholarly conventions expected in sociolinguistic and translation studies research. The structured format facilitates navigation through complex analyses, while the academic tone aligns with the expectations of scholars and students in the field. However, to enhance accessibility and engagement, the paper could benefit from simplifying complex jargon where possible and incorporating more concise summaries or visual aids to distill key findings. These adjustments would make the research more approachable to a broader readership, including those new to the topic, without compromising the depth of analysis.

# 2.g. Are there any formal (e.g. grammar, spelling) mistakes?

**REVIEW 2:** The paper demonstrates proficient writing with no discernible grammatical or spelling errors.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper generally maintains a high level of language proficiency, with only minor grammatical and spelling errors. However, there are instances where sentence structures could be revised for improved clarity and readability. Additionally, some typographical errors, such as missing or misplaced commas, could be addressed to enhance the overall quality of the paper. Nevertheless, these issues do not significantly detract from the paper’s overall coherence and readability, and they can be easily corrected through proofreading and minor revisions.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** I did not identify any significant formal grammar or spelling mistakes in the provided sections of the paper. The writing appears to be well-edited and professionally presented in terms of language and mechanics. However, as I only have access to the text you provided, there might be errors not covered in the sections you shared. It’s always a good practice to have multiple rounds of proofreading and editing to ensure the highest level of accuracy in a research paper.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper does not explicitly mention any formal errors such as grammar or spelling mistakes. However, it is important to note that the assessment of such errors may vary depending on the specific text, and reviewers or editors typically play a crucial role in identifying and correcting these issues during the peer-review process. Therefore, it is advisable for the author to carefully proofread the paper or consider seeking the assistance of a professional proofreader or editor to ensure that it is free from any formal mistakes before submission for publication. Additionally, running a thorough spell check and grammar check using appropriate software can help identify and rectify any overlooked errors.

**ChatGPT 4:** [It couldn’t answer the question with respect to the paper.]

# Other

Here are some other questions I asked corresponding to the fixations in original reports. The prompts below were edited or combined.

# Me: Does anything read abruptly? Are some sections are disjointed? Are there problems with text cohesiveness and transitions

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Throughout the three parts of the paper, the author maintains a relatively smooth and cohesive narrative, minimizing abrupt transitions or disruptions in the flow of the text. However, there are a few instances where the transitions between different sections or topics could be improved for better readability and coherence. In Part 1, while the discussion of the historical usage of “GAY” is generally well-structured, there are a few points where the transition between subtopics could be more seamless. For example, when moving from the discussion of the term’s early usage to its transformation in the 20th century, a clearer transition sentence or paragraph could help connect these ideas more fluidly. In Part 2, when delving into the role of publications like “Der Kreis,” the author introduces this topic somewhat abruptly without a smooth transition from the previous section. Providing a brief contextual bridge could make the transition feel less abrupt and enhance the reader’s comprehension. In Part 3, the discussion of post-Stonewall developments and the adoption of “QUEER” is generally well-paced and connected, but there may be some benefit in reinforcing the connection between the post-Stonewall era and the previous sections to maintain a cohesive thread throughout the paper. Overall, while the paper maintains good cohesion, addressing these minor transition issues could enhance the overall reading experience and make the narrative flow even more smoothly.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper’s sections that appear disjointed are primarily within the second portion, specifically when discussing the translation of LGBTQ+ terminology in different languages. For instance, the paper shifts from discussing the translation of “gay” into French to the use of “gayo” in Spanish without clear transitions or connections between these topics. Additionally, when introducing the concept of “othering framing,” it feels somewhat disconnected from the surrounding discussion, making it challenging for readers to grasp its relevance and implications within the broader context of the paper. These disjointed sections disrupt the paper’s overall flow and coherence, making it more challenging for readers to follow the logical progression of the arguments. To enhance the paper’s clarity and effectiveness, addressing these transitions and ensuring a smoother integration of ideas between sections would be beneficial.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The text’s cohesiveness and transitions pose some challenges for the reader. While the paper attempts to structure its content through numbered sections, the absence of clear headings or titles for each section makes it challenging to discern the main focus of each part. As a result, the reader may struggle to identify the author’s intentions in each section, hindering comprehension. Transitions between ideas and examples are often abrupt, leaving the reader disconnected from the author’s thought process. The paper lacks adequate transitional markers or sentences that would help guide the reader smoothly from one point to the next. This abruptness can make it difficult to follow the logical progression of arguments. Furthermore, the text occasionally revisits previously discussed concepts without clear reminders or summaries, causing confusion and redundancy. The lack of concise summaries or restatements of key points leaves the reader without a strong sense of the paper’s overarching argument. In summary, while the paper makes an effort to structure its content, it falls short in providing clear section titles, smooth transitions between ideas, and effective summaries, ultimately impeding its cohesiveness and readability.

**ChatGPT 4:** The paper’s textual cohesiveness appears to suffer from several critical issues. While it ambitiously tackles the translation and cultural transmission of LGBTQ terminologies, it lacks clear, logical transitions between sections, which undermines the flow of the argument. The structure seems to oscillate between historical analysis, theoretical discussion, and case studies without adequately linking these components back to a central thesis. This disjointed approach can leave readers struggling to discern the paper’s overarching narrative or the significance of individual examples within a broader scholarly conversation. Furthermore, the paper occasionally introduces new concepts or terminologies without sufficient explanation or fails to consistently apply theoretical frameworks, adding to the confusion. To improve cohesiveness, the author needs to streamline the argument, ensuring each section directly contributes to and reinforces the main thesis. Implementing clearer signposting and revisiting key points in the conclusion could also help in weaving the diverse strands of analysis into a coherent narrative, enhancing the paper’s overall impact and readability.

**ChatGPT 4:** The paper’s exploration of LGBTQ terminologies’ translation and adaptation demonstrates an ambitious attempt to weave together historical, linguistic, and cultural threads. While it presents a rich tapestry of analysis, the textual cohesiveness could be enhanced by refining the transitions between its various thematic areas. The narrative sometimes shifts from historical context to theoretical discussion and then to specific case studies without clear linkages, which may challenge readers to follow the progression of the argument seamlessly. However, this approach also reflects the complexity of the subject matter and the breadth of the author’s ambition to cover significant ground. Improvements in textual cohesiveness could be achieved through more explicit connections between the sections, ensuring that each part clearly builds upon the last and ties back to the central thesis. A more deliberate use of signposting to guide the reader through the argument and a consolidation of the paper’s key findings in the conclusion would help articulate the narrative more clearly. By doing so, the author could better highlight the paper’s contributions to our understanding of LGBTQ terminology in a cross-linguistic context, making the research not only more accessible but also more impactful.

# Me: Is enough background information provided on the case study?

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper provides an adequate amount of background information on the case study, which primarily focuses on the historical and linguistic developments of LGBTQ+ terminology, particularly the transition from “GAY” to “QUEER.” However, there is room for improvement in terms of contextualizing the case study further. In Part 1, the author offers a comprehensive historical overview of the term “GAY,” its early uses, and its evolution over time. While this section provides a solid foundation for understanding the subject matter, it could benefit from a brief introduction or contextualization of why the historical analysis of LGBTQ+ terminology is relevant and significant. Additionally, a clearer statement of the research objectives or questions at the beginning of each section could help readers understand the purpose of the case study. In Part 2, the paper delves into the role of publications like “Der Kreis” in shaping LGBTQ+ terminology. While the information provided is valuable, a brief explanation of why “Der Kreis” is a pertinent case study and how it connects to the broader research objectives would enhance the reader’s understanding. In Part 3, the paper explores the post-Stonewall era and the adoption of “QUEER.” Here, the author effectively contextualizes the historical moment and its impact on LGBTQ+ terminology. However, reinforcing the link between the post-Stonewall developments and the earlier sections of the paper could provide a more coherent narrative. Overall, while the paper does provide background information on the case study, adding more explicit contextualization and research objectives could strengthen the reader’s grasp of the paper’s significance and purpose.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Considering the paper as a whole, it does provide adequate background information on the case study, which primarily revolves around the historical and linguistic transformations of LGBTQ+ terminology. However, there is room for improvement in terms of contextualization. The paper offers a comprehensive historical overview of the evolution of LGBTQ+ terminology, from the early uses of “GAY” to the adoption of “QUEER.” It effectively traces the historical trajectory of these terms and their cultural significance. Nonetheless, a more explicit and cohesive contextualization of why this historical analysis of LGBTQ+ terminology matters and how it contributes to broader discussions on sociolinguistics, LGBTQ+ studies, and language evolution could enhance the paper’s overall impact. While the case study of publications like “Der Kreis” and their influence on LGBTQ+ terminology is well-presented, reinforcing the connection between these case studies and the broader research objectives would strengthen the paper’s cohesion. Additionally, ensuring that transitions between sections are smooth and logical would improve the overall flow of the paper. In summary, the paper provides a solid foundation of background information on the case study but could benefit from more explicit contextualization and better transitions to create a more coherent narrative throughout the entire document.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper provides some background information on the case study, specifically related to Donald Webster Cory’s book “The Homosexual in America” and its translations into different languages. However, the background information could benefit from further elaboration and context. While the paper mentions Cory’s book and its influence, it does not delve into the book’s content, the historical and cultural context in which it was written, or the significance of his work within the LGBTQ+ movement. Providing more comprehensive background information on the case study would help readers better understand its importance and relevance within the broader discussion of LGBTQ+ terminology translation. Additionally, the paper could offer more contextual information about the languages and cultures in which these translations occurred. Understanding the linguistic and sociocultural nuances of each language would contribute to a more robust analysis of the translational choices made. Overall, while the paper does introduce the case study, enhancing the background information with more details and context would further enrich the reader’s comprehension of the topic.

**ChatGPT 4:** The case study provides a foundational background on the significance of Donald Webster Cory’s “The Homosexual in America: A Subjective Approach” and its role in the dissemination of LGBTQ terminologies across languages and cultures. It outlines the historical context of the book’s publication and its reception, highlighting its groundbreaking nature as one of the first candid discussions of homosexual life in mid-20th century America. This background is essential for understanding the book’s impact on LGBTQ discourse and the challenges associated with translating its content into other languages. However, for a more comprehensive understanding, the case study could benefit from additional background information in several areas:

* Linguistic Landscape: A deeper exploration of the linguistic landscape regarding LGBTQ terminology before Cory’s work was translated could provide valuable insights into why certain translation choices were made. Understanding the existing lexicon in target languages could illuminate the translators’ challenges and strategies.
* Sociopolitical Context: More detailed information on the sociopolitical context in the countries where translations were made (e.g., Mexico, France) during the 1950s could enrich the analysis. This would include attitudes towards homosexuality, censorship laws, and the role of the press and publishing industry in shaping public discourse on LGBTQ issues.
* Translation Practices and Theories: Expanding on the theoretical framework guiding the translations, including any prevailing translation theories or practices of the time, would offer a deeper understanding of the translators’ approaches and constraints.
* Reception and Impact: Additional details on how Cory’s book and its translations were received by both the LGBTQ communities and the broader public in the target cultures could provide a fuller picture of the work’s impact. This might include references to reviews, sales data, or subsequent discussions in the queer press or academic circles.
* Comparative Analysis: Background on other contemporary works addressing LGBTQ themes and how they were translated could offer a comparative perspective, highlighting what was unique about Cory’s book and its translations.

Providing this additional background information would not only enrich the case study but also strengthen the reader’s understanding of the complex interplay between language, culture, and social movements. It would underscore the significance of Cory’s work and its translations in the broader narrative of LGBTQ history and linguistics.

# Me: Could you criticize the conclusion? Could you provide some ways to improve the conclusion?

**ChatGPT 3.5:** The paper’s conclusion, while generally well-structured and informative, has a few areas that could benefit from further refinement. One potential flaw in the conclusion is its somewhat abrupt ending. It would be beneficial to provide a more comprehensive summarization of the main findings and their implications for future research. The paper could also explore avenues for future research or suggest potential directions for scholars interested in the intersection of LGBTQ+ studies and linguistics. Additionally, the conclusion briefly touches on the conceptual translation of ideas across cultures but could delve deeper into this aspect. A more in-depth discussion of how the translation of LGBTQ+ terminology reflects broader cultural shifts and societal attitudes toward LGBTQ+ issues could enhance the conclusion’s impact. Furthermore, the paper might benefit from a more explicit connection between the conclusion and the introduction. While the introduction sets the stage for the paper, the conclusion could revisit the initial research questions or objectives and explicitly address how they have been addressed or evolved throughout the paper.

In summary, the conclusion is informative but could be improved by providing a more comprehensive summary of findings, discussing future research possibilities, and strengthening the connection with the introduction.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Certainly, here are some concrete bullet points on how the author might improve the conclusion of the paper:

* Comprehensive Summary: Provide a concise yet thorough summary of the main findings presented in the paper. This should encompass the key points from all three parts of the paper, highlighting the most significant insights.
* Implications for Future Research: Discuss potential avenues for future research in the field of LGBTQ+ linguistics. Consider addressing questions that remain unanswered or areas where further exploration is needed.
* Conceptual Translation: Elaborate on the conceptual translation of LGBTQ+ terminology and its significance in reflecting cultural shifts and attitudes. Explore how these translations contribute to broader discussions of LGBTQ+ identity.
* Integration with Introduction: Reinforce the connection with the introduction by revisiting the initial research questions or objectives. Explicitly address how these questions have been addressed or evolved throughout the paper.
* Practical Implications: If applicable, discuss any practical implications of the research findings. How might the insights gained from studying LGBTQ+ terminology impact language policies, activism, or LGBTQ+ communities?
* Encourage Reflection: Encourage readers to reflect on the broader sociolinguistic implications of the research and how it contributes to a deeper understanding of LGBTQ+ experiences.
* Avoid Abrupt Ending: Ensure that the conclusion does not end abruptly. The transition from the main body of the paper to the conclusion should feel seamless and offer a satisfying wrap-up of the research.
* Relevance to Readers: Make it clear why the research matters not only to scholars but also to a broader audience interested in LGBTQ+ issues, language, and identity.
* Synthesize Key Points: Synthesize the key points made throughout the paper, emphasizing their significance and relevance to the field of linguistics and LGBTQ+ studies.
* Closing Remarks: End with thoughtful closing remarks that leave a lasting impression on the reader, reinforcing the importance of the research and its potential impact.

These bullet points can serve as a guide for the author to enhance the conclusion and ensure that it effectively summarizes the paper’s contributions and implications.

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Certainly, here are some brief ways to improve the conclusion of the paper to make it more synthesizing:

* Summarize Key Findings: Provide a concise summary of the main findings or contributions of the paper. Highlight the most significant insights that have emerged from the research.
* Reiterate the Thesis: Restate the main thesis or research question and emphasize how the paper has addressed it. This reinforces the central focus of the paper.
* Connect with the Introduction: Refer back to the opening statements or questions posed in the introduction. Show how the paper has addressed these initial concerns.
* Highlight Implications: Discuss the broader implications of the research. What are the potential real-world applications or consequences of the findings? How might they impact future research or practices?
* Suggest Future Directions: Offer suggestions for future research in this area. What questions remain unanswered, and how might scholars build upon the current study?
* End with a Thought-Provoking Insight: Conclude with a thought-provoking insight, quotation, or question that leaves the reader with something to ponder. This can make the conclusion more memorable.
* Avoid Introducing New Information: Ensure that the conclusion does not introduce new information or arguments. It should primarily reiterate and synthesize what has already been presented in the paper.
* Maintain Conciseness: Keep the conclusion concise and to the point. Avoid unnecessary repetition or lengthy explanations.

By incorporating these elements, the conclusion can become a more effective synthesis of the paper’s key points and leave a lasting impression on the reader.

**ChatGPT 4:**

The conclusion of the paper, while summarizing the research findings on the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies across languages, may lack a compelling synthesis of its broader implications. It presents the outcomes of the analysis but might fall short in fully articulating the significance of these findings for the fields of sociolinguistics, translation studies, and queer theory. Additionally, it may not sufficiently address the potential for future research or practical applications of the study’s insights. Here are some critical observations and suggestions for improvement:

* Broader Implications: The conclusion could be enhanced by more explicitly connecting the research findings to larger theoretical and practical questions within the study’s disciplines. Discussing how these findings challenge, confirm, or expand existing theories would not only underscore the paper’s contribution to scholarly debates but also its novelty.
* Future Research Directions: While the paper offers valuable insights, the conclusion might benefit from a clearer articulation of gaps that remain unaddressed, suggesting specific areas for future investigation. This could include the exploration of digital spaces for LGBTQ terminology evolution, the impact of social media on language change, or comparative studies across more diverse linguistic and cultural contexts.
* Methodological Reflections: A more critical reflection on the study’s limitations and the implications of these limitations for the findings could strengthen the conclusion. Acknowledging the scope of the research, the potential biases in source selection, or the challenges of interpreting translation choices could provide a more nuanced understanding of the study’s contributions.
* Practical Applications: The paper could enhance its relevance by discussing the practical applications of its findings, particularly for translators, language educators, activists, and policymakers working within LGBTQ communities. Highlighting how this research can inform translation practices, language policy, or educational materials would demonstrate the real-world impact of the study.
* Engagement with Counterarguments: Incorporating a discussion of any counterarguments or alternative interpretations encountered during the research could add depth to the conclusion. This engagement would illustrate the complexity of the issues at hand and position the paper as a thoughtful contribution to ongoing scholarly conversations.

Tips for Improvement:

* Synthesize Key Findings: Clearly summarize the key findings and their implications in a way that emphasizes their contribution to existing knowledge.
* Highlight Novel Contributions: Explicitly state what is new or innovative about the research, and why it matters to the field.
* Recommend Future Research: Offer specific suggestions for how future studies could build on this work, identifying potential new research questions or methodologies.
* Discuss Practical Implications: Outline how the findings can be applied in practice, whether in translation, education, activism, or policy.
* Reflect on Limitations: Acknowledge the study’s limitations openly and discuss how these might influence the interpretations of the findings.

By addressing these aspects, the conclusion can serve not only as a summary of the research but as a compelling argument for its significance, a roadmap for future inquiry, and a bridge to practical applications and broader scholarly debates.

# Me: Are there omissions in terms of the literature review or the methodological or theoretical basis?

**ChatGPT 3.5:** Certainly, let’s take a closer look at potential omissions in terms of literature review and methodological or theoretical basis:

* Literature review: The paper does a commendable job in reviewing existing literature related to LGBTQ+ terminology and its translation. However, there is room for improvement in terms of comprehensiveness. Some recent or critical works in the field may have been overlooked. Additionally, a more critical engagement with existing literature, such as highlighting gaps or areas of debate within the field, could have added depth to the paper’s discussion.
* Methodological Basis: While the paper provides a methodological framework for analyzing LGBTQ+ terminology translation, it would benefit from a more explicit explanation of the chosen methodology’s strengths and limitations. Clearer justification for the selection of specific case studies and examples would enhance the paper’s rigor. Additionally, discussing any potential biases or challenges in the chosen methodology could contribute to a more transparent research approach.
* Theoretical Basis: The paper could further strengthen its theoretical foundation by explicitly stating the theoretical framework it operates within. Identifying and explaining the theoretical lenses through which LGBTQ+ terminology translation is analyzed would help readers understand the underlying assumptions and perspectives shaping the research.

In summary, while the paper does offer a literature review and methodological framework, there is potential for improvement in terms of comprehensiveness in the literature review, a more robust discussion of the chosen methodology, and a clearer identification of the theoretical basis guiding the research. These refinements could enhance the overall quality and rigor of the paper.

# Me: Is the paper novel?

**ChatGPT 4 (attempt 1):**

The paper exhibits a degree of novelty in its focused examination of the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies across languages, particularly through the lens of sociolinguistic change and the impact of cultural and activist movements. The case study approach, highlighting specific instances of term adoption and adaptation, offers fresh insights into the complex dynamics of language contact, translation practices, and identity politics within the LGBTQ community. This focus contributes to an understanding of how linguistic practices both reflect and influence societal attitudes toward gender and sexuality. However, the novelty of the paper could be perceived as limited by several factors. The extent of its originality might be questioned due to the heavy reliance on the author’s previous works without sufficiently incorporating a broader range of perspectives or recent research in the field. Additionally, while the paper delves into specific examples of term translation and adaptation, a truly novel contribution would also critically engage with and expand upon existing theories of language change, translation studies, and identity formation in new and unexpected ways.

To enhance its novelty, the paper could benefit from integrating more interdisciplinary approaches or emerging theories that challenge conventional understandings of language and identity within the LGBTQ context. For instance, exploring the role of digital media and online communities in the transnational spread of LGBTQ terminologies or examining the intersections of language with race, class, and global inequalities could offer innovative angles and significantly enrich the paper’s contributions. In summary, while the paper presents an interesting case study with elements of novelty, its originality could be amplified by broadening its theoretical scope, diversifying its sources, and engaging more deeply with current debates and emerging trends in sociolinguistics, translation studies, and queer theory.

**ChatGPT 4 (attempt 2, more critical):**

While the paper under discussion makes strides towards exploring the sociolinguistic evolution of LGBTQ terminologies across languages, its claim to novelty warrants a more critical examination. The novelty of a scholarly work is often gauged by its ability to fill an existing gap in the literature, propose a new theoretical framework, or offer groundbreaking empirical findings. In this case, the paper’s focus on translation practices and the cross-linguistic adoption of terms like “GAY” and “QUEER” is undeniably pertinent. However, the novelty might be diluted by several critical factors:

* Over-reliance on Self-citation: The frequent citation of the author’s previous work could suggest a circumscribed engagement with the broader scholarly dialogue on the topic. This practice may inadvertently narrow the research lens, potentially overshadowing novel perspectives or recent advancements made by other scholars in the field of sociolinguistics, translation studies, and queer theory.
* Lack of Methodological Innovation: The paper’s methodological approach, while thorough, does not appear to introduce new techniques or analytical frameworks for studying the translation and adaptation of LGBTQ terminologies. Novelty in research often emerges from innovative methodological designs that can offer new insights or uncover previously unnoticed patterns. The absence of such innovation may limit the paper’s contribution to advancing the methodological toolbox of its field.
* Insufficient Theoretical Contributions: The paper’s theoretical underpinnings, while informed by existing literature, do not clearly articulate a novel theoretical contribution that could redefine or significantly advance understanding of language change in the context of LGBTQ terminologies. Novelty is often measured by a study’s ability to challenge, refine, or extend existing theories in ways that open up new avenues for research.
* Limited Engagement with Contrasting Perspectives: A critical aspect of novelty involves engaging with and potentially synthesizing divergent perspectives to forge new understandings. The paper’s discussion might have benefited from a more explicit engagement with contrasting viewpoints or debates within the field, thereby situating its findings within a wider and potentially contentious scholarly landscape.

In conclusion, while the paper provides valuable insights into the sociolinguistic dynamics of LGBTQ terminology, its novelty could be enhanced by more explicitly addressing these critical areas. Expanding the scope of literature reviewed, incorporating innovative methodological approaches, articulating clear theoretical contributions, and engaging more deeply with a range of scholarly debates would strengthen the paper’s originality and impact.

# Me: Could you respond to the questions in the first person, using “I” and “me” etc., instead of talking omnisciently?

[Note how it struggles.]

**ChatGPT 3.5 (attempt 1):**

1.1. Does the paper present original research?

Yes, the paper presents original research. The author conducts a thorough analysis of translations and their impact on the dissemination of LGBTQ+ terminology across languages. They explore various translations of the term “gay” and “queer” in different contexts, shedding light on the complexity of lexical adaptation and the sociolinguistic factors influencing these choices.

1.2. Is the author explicit about what knowledge s/he is adding to the knowledge already presented elsewhere?

Yes, the author is explicit about the knowledge they are contributing. They emphasize the need to contextualize the translations within a broader sociopragmatic and lexicological framework, highlighting gaps in the existing literature and offering insights into the historical development of LGBTQ+ terminology.

1.3. Is it clear what the reported research is founded on?

Yes, it is clear what the reported research is founded on. The author bases their analysis on a wide range of primary sources, including translations, historical texts, and activist publications. They also reference existing scholarship in the field of translation studies and LGBTQ+ linguistics to provide a solid foundation for their research.

1.4. Is there enough reference to the relevant literature?

Yes, there is a sufficient reference to relevant literature. The author incorporates references to previous research in translation studies, LGBTQ+ linguistics, and sociolinguistics to support their arguments and contextualize their findings within the existing scholarly discourse.

1.5. Is the author’s line of reasoning explicit?

Yes, the author’s line of reasoning is explicit. They clearly outline their research objectives, methodology, and the rationale behind their analysis of translations. The author’s arguments are well-structured, making it easy for readers to follow their line of thought.

1.6. Are there any flawed arguments?

I did not identify any major flaws in the author’s arguments. However, some sections could benefit from further clarification or expansion to strengthen the overall argumentation.

1.7. Are the examples adduced relevant? Are they interpreted correctly?

The examples provided in the paper are relevant to the research objectives and help illustrate the author’s points effectively. The interpretations of these examples appear accurate and align with the paper’s analytical framework.

2.a. Does the paper present original research? Is the author explicit about what knowledge s/he is adding to the knowledge already presented elsewhere? Is it clear what the reported research is founded on? Is there enough reference to the relevant literature?

Yes, the paper presents original research that contributes to the understanding of LGBTQ+ terminology translation. The author explicitly outlines their contributions to existing knowledge, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive lexicological analysis within a sociopragmatic context. The research is founded on a diverse range of primary sources and references existing literature effectively to provide a solid foundation for the study.

2.b. Is the author’s line of reasoning explicit? Are there any flawed arguments? Are the examples adduced relevant? Are they interpreted correctly?

The author’s line of reasoning is explicit throughout the paper, making it easy for readers to follow the logical progression of their arguments. While there are no major flawed arguments, some sections could benefit from further elaboration or clarification. The examples provided are relevant to the research objectives and are generally interpreted correctly within the paper’s analytical framework.

2.c. Are there any important omissions?

There are no significant omissions in terms of research objectives, methodology, or analysis within the paper. However, the paper could benefit from further exploration of specific case studies or a deeper dive into certain aspects of the translation process to enhance the comprehensiveness of the research.

2.d. Is there any material that is superfluous in relation to the objectives of the paper?

There doesn’t appear to be any superfluous material in relation to the paper’s objectives. The author maintains a focus on the central research questions and relevant content throughout the paper.

2.e. Are examples in less commonly known languages sufficiently and plausibly explained?

The paper effectively explains examples in less commonly known languages, ensuring that readers can grasp the context and significance of these examples. The explanations are plausible and contribute to the paper’s overall argumentation.

2.f. Is the format of the paper appropriate and the writing style suitable for the intended readership?

The format of the paper is appropriate, with clear section headings and a structured presentation of the research. The writing style is suitable for the intended readership, combining academic rigor with accessible language to engage both scholars and those interested in LGBTQ+ terminology and translation studies.

2.g. Are there any formal (e.g. grammar, spelling) mistakes?

I did not identify any formal mistakes in terms of grammar or spelling within the paper. The text is well-edited and maintains a high level of linguistic accuracy.

**ChatGPT 3.5 (attempt 2, same chat):**

1.1. Yes, the paper indeed presents original research. I found the author’s analysis of translations and their impact on LGBTQ+ terminology dissemination across languages to be quite original and insightful. It sheds light on the complexities of lexical adaptation and the sociolinguistic factors influencing these choices.

1.2. The author is explicit about their contributions to existing knowledge. They emphasize the need to contextualize translations within a broader sociopragmatic and lexicological framework, addressing gaps in the literature and providing historical insights into LGBTQ+ terminology.

1.3. It’s clear that the reported research is founded on a solid foundation. The author bases their analysis on a wide range of primary sources, including translations, historical texts, and activist publications. They also reference existing scholarship effectively to support their arguments.

1.4. The paper includes sufficient references to relevant literature. The author incorporates references from previous research in translation studies, LGBTQ+ linguistics, and sociolinguistics to support their arguments and provide context for their findings.

1.5. The author’s line of reasoning is explicit and well-structured. They outline their research objectives, methodology, and rationale clearly, making it easy for readers like me to follow their thought process.

1.6. While I did not identify any major flaws in the author’s arguments, some sections could benefit from further clarification or expansion to strengthen the overall argumentation.

1.7. The examples provided in the paper are relevant to the research objectives and effectively illustrate the author’s points. The interpretations of these examples align with the paper’s analytical framework.

2.a. Yes, the paper certainly presents original research that contributes significantly to our understanding of LGBTQ+ terminology translation. The author explicitly states their contributions to existing knowledge and highlights the need for a comprehensive lexicological analysis within a sociopragmatic context. The research is grounded in a diverse range of primary sources and effectively references existing literature to provide a strong foundation.

2.b. The author’s line of reasoning is clear throughout the paper, making it easy for readers like me to follow their arguments logically. While I didn’t identify any major flawed arguments, some sections could benefit from additional elaboration or clarification. The examples provided are relevant to the research objectives and are generally interpreted correctly within the paper’s analytical framework.

2.c. I didn’t notice any significant omissions in terms of research objectives, methodology, or analysis within the paper. However, delving deeper into specific case studies or exploring certain aspects of the translation process could enhance the comprehensiveness of the research.

2.d. There doesn’t seem to be any superfluous material in relation to the paper’s objectives. The author maintains a focused approach, centering on the central research questions and relevant content throughout the paper.

2.e. The paper effectively explains examples in less commonly known languages, ensuring that readers can grasp the context and significance of these examples. The explanations are plausible and contribute to the paper’s overall argumentation.

2.f. The format of the paper is appropriate, with clear section headings and a structured presentation of the research. The writing style is suitable for the intended readership, combining academic rigor with accessible language to engage both scholars and those interested in LGBTQ+ terminology and translation studies.

2.g. I did not come across any formal mistakes in terms of grammar or spelling within the paper. The text appears to be well-edited and maintains a high level of linguistic accuracy.