Review by Ana Bravo

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

The study aims to assess the vitality of the construction in a province in western Sicily. Seen in this light, it does not seem to be a major contribution, mainly because the construction, cross-linguistically pervasive, does not seem to show any signs of decay. However, the author offers convincing reasons to carry it out, so in the end, I would dare to say that it helps to understand the topic, and also, why not, to open new ways of research, amenable to be carried out in other languages.

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]

Yes. Without comments.

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.

Ross (2021) is mentioned on page 4, in the fn 6. I would like to suggest the author mention it at the end of the first paragraph, since, to my knowledge, this paper contains the most exhaustive list of references on MAC, many of which go well ten or twenty years back, at least. As it is presented in the text, it seems that it is a construction restricted to these varieties and recently studied.

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.