

Review by Julie Auger

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

Yes. It analyzes subject doubling in a new corpus and proposes an analysis that tries to reconcile the 2 main analyses that have been proposed and that are still very much debated. The points it makes about the different types of topics and the need to distinguish them is an important one and a good argument why Culbertson's conclusion should be looked into more closely. The number of tokens analyzed is large and this constitutes another strength of the article.

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 empirical content of the paper is sound, but the statistics are not always well explained. Some of the tools that are used, for example, are not explained. E.g., what is a ROC curve? What is an AUC.

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 coherent and sound, but one important alternative analysis is not considered: the possibility that different examples correspond to different structures and that this is in part why different linguists favor different analyses and why support is found for both the morphological and the dislocation analyses. Would the researcher label and analyze "Marie" in "Marie, je me souviens quand elle s'est cassé la jambe" and in "Je me souviens quand Marie elle s'est cassé la jambe" as subject doubling in both cases? It seems to me that the 2 structures are very different and that the first one clearly contains an instance of left dislocation and the second an instance of subject doubling.

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

I don't have the references, but I am fairly sure that some linguists have analyzed the subjects in null-subject languages like Spanish as occurring in topic positions rather than subject positions. It seems to me that this research should be consulted and the consequences of the analysis proposed considered.

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]

The English will require the intervention of a native speaker. Although the paper is generally well written, some passages are ungrammatical and/or infelicitous.

A distinction must be made between dislocation and doubling.

The author should consider and discuss the possibility that two different constructions coexist in colloquial French.

It should be made clear that the article focuses on colloquial French, not just spoken French.

See the other comments in the attached file.

Review for Isogloss

Yes, there are 2 main analyses for the lexical subject + coreferential subject clitic construction and different arguments for both. The two constructions also have different names and structures. The author of this manuscript doesn't appear to consider the possibility that colloquial French may make use of both and that this may explain why they find evidence for both analyses.

“Spoken French”: this is too general. Spoken French can be very formal, very informal, and everything in between. When talking about subject doubling, the author should specify that they are referring to colloquial spoken French.

p2 “This type of subject doubling, known as *postverbal subject doubling*”: No. This is more often referred to as subject right dislocation.

P3 “which considers subject doubling as an instance of left dislocation”: It would be preferable to reserve *subject doubling* to the analysis where the clitic is an agreement marker, and to use a more descriptive phrase such as *the cooccurrence of a lexical subject and a coreferential subject clitic*.

P7 What does “uni-word DP subjects” mean? Please explain and provide an example.

P9 The calculation of the number of intervening words: Other pronoun clitics count? this should be explained. Should short pronominal clitics and adverbs count for the same thing? I'm not convinced that is the best way to capture the possible effect of intervening materials. At the very least, they should be distinguished in order to see whether that makes a difference or not.

P11 Table 1: What does “Positive coefficients for categorical predictors signify a preference for the doubling in the first level over the second.”?

P11 Table 1: explanation required for numbers of asterisks.

P15 *dsensitive*: typo? If not, explanation?

P16 It would be good to mention the work of Massot and Zribi-Hertz and that of Villeneuve and Auger (2013) in connexion to the rarity of the cooccurrence subject doubling and overt realization of *ne*.

P17 *thid effect of distance*: *third*? Even if this is correct, this needs to be explained.

P19 Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998)'s hypothesis on null subject languages: I don't think it is explained in the manuscript.

P19 About *David il l'a déjà invité*: the distinction between dislocation and doubling needs to be made. This is an example of dislocation, not object doubling.