Review by Bryan Koronkiewicz

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 our understanding of zero complements by providing evidence that they are not all created equal, showing that there are two different types. Additionally, it proves cross linguistic data that these types can vary from language to language, as the French data suggests there is both background deletion and null pronouns, whereas the Spanish data only suggests the former.

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 found the empirical content of the paper to be of extremely high quality. Of utmost note is the paper's clarity of the linguistic structure under analysis and the design of the experiment. The results are generally easy to follow as well, but see my note below about the fuzziness of intermingling the descriptive results with the statistical analysis. Disentangling the two would help provide further clarity to an otherwise exceedingly clear paper.

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 paper presents a well-structured and methodologically sound argument within the context of the theoretical assumptions. The research objective is clearly defined, aiming to investigate the status of zero complements in French and Spanish. The author provides an appropriate overview of the decades' long history of zero complements while also connecting with recent research about the heterogeneity of French prepositions. The methodology is laid out clearly and the use of data from acceptability judgment experiments is a well-accepted and justified approach in the field. The inclusion of a cross-linguistic comparison in particular is a valuable aspect of the research that helps provide deeper insights into this linguistic phenomenon.

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

There are no overlooked citations that I am aware of.

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, I have not seen this paper or its content, analysis, or conclusions published in other venues.

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]

There are only a few minor questions/revisions:

- When laying out the background for zero complements in the introduction, the author brings up the notion of a 'full sentence' as compared to reduced structures. This is an important distinction that is part of the experimental design as well. To be exceedingly clear, it would probably be worthwhile for the authors to explicitly define what makes a sentence one or the

other from the onset. (It partially comes up in Footnote 7, but I think it would be good to address this more explicitly in the body of the manuscript.)

- Relatedly, there is also a typo there I noticed; on page 4 the sentence "While in (1) is a 'full sentence' without narrow contrastive focus..." the 'in' should be deleted.

- Participants used a 5-point Likert scale for their acceptability ratings, with the extreme ends labeled. As shown in Figure 1, the middle three point are not labeled at all, which in and of itself is not an issue; but it is common to have the points numbered when only labeling the extreme ends. Can the authors provide any clarity on that decision? On that same note, some more information about the training phase would be helpful; for example, it could be that those middle points are addressed in the training.

- Organizationally the French results section begins immediately with the statistical analysis. Is there a reason that descriptive information was not provided first, and then have the statistical analysis afterward? This common approach of laying out the descriptiveness helps the reader understand the general patterns in data first; the stats can then be used to explicitly answer the research questions. What's interesting is that the Spanish results do follow this general pattern, but in general the the section constantly interspersed with the stats, and my point is that for clarity, it may be helpful to disentangle that a bit.

- On a related note, on page 16 there is a reference to Figure 5 which should be to Figure 4, I believe.