

-----  
**Review by Vincent Surrel**  
-----

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

The comparison of complex coda segments in two geographically close areas seems to us to be fully justified within the framework of the Strict CV theory and is therefore innovative. It may also make it possible to establish comparisons with other Romance areas.

The author is particularly careful to justify his argument, and the article is easy to read.

**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 use of a recent oral corpus is interesting and allows for relevant observations.

We strongly advise the author to complete the tables with examples of the different tokens observed, to make the observation a little more concrete.

**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]**

We have no comments to make on the implementation of the Strict CV theory.

The discussion of lateral phonemes in section 4 seems to us to be correctly articulated with the observations in section 3.

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

NO

**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]**

Add the reference Mooney & Hawkey 2019 to the bibliography

In the bibliography, Bec 1963 more likely refers to La langue occitane, Paris, PUF.

In section 2.1. the term 'standard', even with inverted commas, is perhaps to be avoided given its sociolinguistic implications: rather use a term as a « reference variety »?

-----