

Review by Anonymous

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

The paper investigates role of prosody on the interpretation of disjunction in Romanian, based on an experiment involving both adults and 5-year-old children. The topic of the acquisition of prosody in the interpretation of disjunction in Romanian is not really studied, therefore the experiments are useful. The author mentions that in a previous study (Author 2023a) (s)he already found that children were not sensitive in interpretation to the different prosodic contours of the simple disjunction 'sau' ('or'). In the present article the author presents an experiment in which the participants are given a forced choice task with neutral and marked 'sau', in order to see if contrasting utterances may play a role in children's interpretation.

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]*

It would be useful to include in the article all 8 pairs of disjunctive utterances used in the experiment (if space allows), because now only one pair is included (and repeated in various sections of the article). Did all the pairs of disjunctive utterances involve two objects on display or were there more? (See the observations in Skordos et al. 2020, mentioned in the article.)

As a general comment regarding experiments on acquisition: it would be interesting to specify which participants were boys or girls, since there are sex differences in communication development, with boys being at a disadvantage.

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]*

It seems that more experiments or more type of utterances are needed before reaching a conclusion regarding the acquisition of the interpretation of disjunction. It would benefit the article /discussion to present all types of sentences used in the experiment, especially since other authors (some mentioned in this article, e.g. Skordos et al. 2020) show that there is a possibility that conjunctive readings of disjunction in 5 year-olds may be an experimental artifact, in some cases.

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

The references are relevant.

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.]*

I have not seen this paper published elsewhere.

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 feel like the utterances involved in the experiment deserve a little bit more space in the article, especially since the children's responses are very mixed.