

Review by Ion Giurgea

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

Yes, the paper makes a novel contribution to the topic under investigation.

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]*

The empirical content of the paper is sound, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done.

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]*

The argumentation is sound.

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

For the description of the Romanian prosody within the ToBI framework, the author(s) should have a look at

Jitcă, Doina, Vasile Apopei, Otilia Păduraru & Samuil Marușca. 2015. Transcription of Romanian intonation. In Sonia Frota & Pilar Prieto (eds.), *Intonation in Romance*, 284-316. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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]

The description of the prosody of the two types of tested sentences should be revised, in my opinion. Before fig. 3, the author states that "Alongside the boundary

type L%, L* is usually expected in statements." But this only applies to nuclear accents. On prenuclear accents, certain H* tones are expected, L+<H* or H*, see Jitcă et al. (2015). It is surprising that no H accents are shown in Figures 3 and 4, the spectrogram indicates some rises at the beginning of the words "găina" and "trenul" which should probably be correlated with the lexical accents on -i- and tre-. The level of F0 at the beginning of the word barca may also indicate a H+L* nuclear tone. The F0 on "barca" in Figure 5 is very different from what we see in Figure 4. This may indicate H+L* in Fig.4 and just L* in Fig.5. Moreover, on the audio file the most striking fact by which the marked pattern differs from the unmarked one is a break before "sau". This seems to be indicated by the use of "%" before the H* of sau in Figure 4, but is not described in the text. It should be. I also suspect that this may explain the association of the "marked" pattern with the exclusive reading - I have the impression that the

speaker proposes a sentence, and then (s)he proposes an alternative. So maybe we actually have disjunction at the clausal level, with ellipsis; this may be correlated with the (relative) preference for the exclusive reading because the two alternatives A and B are each explicitly uttered (the explanation proposed by the authors, relying on a general notion of "markedness", is rather vague, it is not fully clear why markedness should specifically refer to the exclusive reading, given the fact that adults tend to interpret disjunction exclusively anyway, as the authors say).

Minor corrections: page 6, 6 lines before section 3: "to associate marked sau in contexts" : maybe "with contexts";

page 4, below ex. 10: "They found that when disjunction was associated with a Rise-Fall contour (e.g., Wanna stay or go?) or when there was inconsistency between the disjuncts, "or" was more likely to be interpreted exclusively": the last part is superfluous: inconsistency was defined as incompatibility between the disjuncts, so how could "or" be not interpreted exclusively in this case?

page 8, above ex. 12 : "appropriate utterance containing "and" ": replace "and" with "all";

above ex. 13 : "difference in strength between may and is/have to": "have" should be in italics.