
Review by Mercedes Marcilese

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

The paper makes a relevant contribution to integrate the theoretical proposal of DM and fundamental questions for the field of language acquisition. Additionally, the paper brings an interesting discussion regarding possible differences between machine learning (computational models) and language acquisition by human children.

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 paper presents empirical data from diverse sources, namely computational models, language acquisition, and diachronic change. Taken together, the empirical content is sound.

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 argument is quite robust. A particularly positive point is that the argument is constructed from diverse data (computational modeling, acquisition by children across several languages and diachronic change) that contribute coherently to supporting the proposal.

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

The main references were adequately included in the paper.

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.]

This reviewer is not aware of any previous publications of the analysis or the conclusions presented in the paper under review.

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 title seemed truncated to me. "Consequences for the lexical" what? Lexical learning? Establish a parallel between "lexical X" and "language acquisition" also seemed strange for me.

I recommend that the title be revised.

- Abstract: "This paper explores the implications of this prediction for language acquisition research and questions if DM is descriptively and theoretically ??? (sound??) when faced with acquisition phenomena". There seems to be a word missing here.

- P. 11 - DM approach: - Psycholinguistic approaches to the lexicon, such as Levelt's, for example, assume the existence of sublexical units. Units such as lemma and lexeme could be compatible with the items contained in List 1 and List 2, roughly. List 3, on the other hand, seems to be more difficult to reconcile with a psycholinguistics point of view (and also with language acquisition) since it combines both encyclopedic knowledge and some aspects traditionally characterized within lexical semantics. It would be interesting to further explore this issue, especially regarding the possible psychological reality of these theoretical constructs. How can we explain semantic or phonological "interferences" in lexical access based on a model that assumes relative independence between the three lists? How can we integrate the DM approach with evidence regarding different stages of the word retrieval process (in production and comprehension)? (<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.825020>)

If you reject the paper, do you have any suggestions for how to improve it? [max 500 words]

N/A.