

Review by Gloria Cocchi

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

Yes, the paper tackles an already debated and interesting topic, CD deletion in Italo-Romance, but discusses it under a novel approach, the Parametric Comparison Method, aiming to predict parametric implications and capture the different state of affairs in different varieties.

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]*

Everything is properly and clearly presented except for some examples in the Florentine dialect which are not adequate (e.g. (1b) non -> un; exs in (30): tonic 'te' is generally avoided and better 'un tu' rather than 'tu un').

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]*

Yes

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

Yes. Author should make reference, besides Cocchi & Poletto (2002), also to Cocchi & Poletto (2007), which represents a step forward in the analysis of CD.

Here follows the complete reference:

G. Cocchi and C. Poletto (2007). "Complementizer deletion and double complementizers", in: M.C. Picchi & A. Pona (eds.), Proceedings of the "XXXII Incontro di Grammatica Generativa", Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 49-62.

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]

- 1) Correct the examples in the Florentine dialect
- 2) Mention some conclusions reached in Cocchi & Poletto (2007).

In particular, the latter work already proposes an implicational scale among different types of CD in different varieties (though obviously with a different approach with respect to the present paper).

Besides, in that work a different explanation is offered (alongside with PF constraints) for

ungrammatical sentences like (15), mentioned throughout the paper, i.e. that Alternative Checking is performed via Agree without pied-piping.