
Reviewer D:
Eva Rodriguez Gonzalez

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

Yes, the manuscript addresses an important aspect in scholarship of teaching and learning regarding pragmatic functions in L2-L3. The author builds from previous research on the topic and addresses gaps in the field by adding multiple language profiles of Spanish learners and dialects of Spanish as a target language. The inclusion of corpus data from Twitter and the implementation of an "acceptability/judgement" experiment advances previous contributions on the same and similar functions. One aspect that I found a bit confusing about the study was the identification of the experiment as a production one. From what is described in the procedure section of the study, it looks like this is an acceptability or judgement experiment as participants are already provided with four options to choose from instead of "producing" an answer. I would suggest the author to reconsider the use of "production" study or specify in which sense the author considers this kind of experiment as a production one (speaking and/or writing output expectation in traditional production studies). Additionally, it would be helpful for a reader to have an introductory section on what is known so far (even not that much has been paid attention to in the literature) regarding the teaching of pragmatic functions in foreign language teaching. Finally, some additional detail in the Intro section regarding previous methodological considerations in previous studies might be helpful (naturalistic production studies, experimental production...).

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]

I found the experiment to be well designed and stats carefully selected and presented. Based on the details provided, experiment is replicable and rationale for selecting different varieties of Spanish was explained in detail. I offer here some suggestions for consideration to help replicability and clearer understanding of the interpretation of results: 1. It would be helpful to explain with more detail the difference in terms of proficiency between the two sub-

categories of basic and conversational (merged category of "basic" and "being able to have a simple conversation") as compared to fluent: How was that determined in the present study (self-rated by participants in questionnaire at the end?), 2. The selected target sentences, even for comprehension purposes, seem complicated for a "conversational" learner of Spanish. Did the author conduct any sort of trial for comprehension of overall sentences to determine readiness to choose between "creo" and "pienso"?, 3. Section 2.2. would benefit from clarifying in parenthesis the use of 12 target sentences (exact number of sentences with one expression vs. the other) and the rationale for 36 fillers (why 12 with complement clause and the double with simple sentences?, example of filler sentences?), 4. Were participants asked about previous exposure to teaching Spanish in terms of instruction modalities, grammar teaching approaches...? All this information could be key for interpretation of results later in the discussion. Or maybe some of the information could be identified for future research as additional factors to consider.

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]

Argumentation flows quite well and discussion is built on key literature on the topic and previous findings. One of the shortcomings I find in this version of the manuscript is the measure of language proficiency in the L2 and L3 languages involved. A more detailed description of the profiles of the participants in terms of proficiency might help with data analysis.

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

Travis, Catherine E. and Rena Torres Cacoullos (2021). Categories and Frequency: Cognition verbs in Spanish Subject Expression.Languages 6(3)126; https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6030126

Félix-Brasdefer, J. César (2008) Teaching Pragmatics in the Classroom: Instruction of Mitigation in Spanish as a Foreign Language. Hispania 91 (2): 479-494. Additional references for recommendation.

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. The author builds from previous contributions by him/her/themself(ves) but states the differences between previous work and present study by addressing previous limitations.

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. Addition of detail about differences between conversational and fluent categories for Spanish proficiency. A paragraph will suffice.
2. Clarification on the nature of the production study as such (vs. comprehension study).
3. Addition of details regarding previous methodological approaches used in the literature.
4. Incorporation of a brief summary of references regarding the limited research on teaching pragmatic functions in L2/foreign language teaching literature and the rationale for the importance of more research about it.