

Review by

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

The paper presents a very needed contribution to the understanding of the distribution of Partitive Articles (PAs) and invariable 'De' in Francoprovençal (FP) varieties. First, it shows that the distinction between two FP systems (A and B) is not so definite regarding these items, and variables like the different contexts or morphology play a role in the distribution. Second, the implicational scale of contexts allowing PAs is an interesting generalization which should receive attention in further research. Finally, it is interesting that Number morphology has a role in the distribution, but not so systematically as previously supposed.

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

I have no specific negative remarks about the methodology, and the data collection and organization. One way to improve the presentation of the data is adding some relevant examples showing some comparison between different varieties when discussing the distribution in the section 4, which is not always easily readable. However I leave it to the authors to decide whether adding such examples.

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

Notice that the goal of the paper is to discuss some generalizations regarding the presence of PAs and the relation between these and overt Number morphology on nouns. From this point of view the discussion is coherent and the conclusions are fully sharable. However, the paper does not take into consideration theoretical explanations of the mentioned generalizations.

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

No.

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

No.

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

I recommend the paper to be accepted