

Review by Monica Irimia

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

The paper presents very interesting data, which have not been previously discussed in detail. Therefore, this part is clearly novel. Also, it shows that variation in differential object marking and clitic doubling strategies is more complex than generally thought and is thus in need of proper analysis. Thank you so much for bringing this paper to our attention. We encourage the authors to continue the work on the topic, as the data and the question of how to analyze them have great potential.

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]*

Although the data are very interesting, we feel that additional information is needed in order to allow the readers to correctly parse and analyze them. For example, it is not clear if the clitic doubling mechanism which is at the core of the paper is always obligatory, if there are instances in which the clitic double might be missing on the objects (and if yes, what are these instances), what other Spanish varieties present a similar phenomenon (a point briefly alluded to in the paper, but without exemplification), if clitic doubling which agrees in the full set of phi-features is completely ungrammatical, etc. Also, the grammar and style need to be double-checked and it would be useful for the author(s) to send the paper to a proof-reader. We have signaled these points and others on the paper itself.

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]*

Although the analysis is on the right track, in our view, the readers have to be provided with additional details. For example, it is said in the introduction that the account follows some observations previously made by Roberts (2010) or van der Wal (2015), regarding the issue of so-called Defective Goals. However, these two approaches are not spelled out in detail so that the readers can evaluate in what sense the current proposal follows them or diverges from them. In our view, this aspect is important; the paper deals with a thorny issue, among others - what is the status of the third person? Does it contain a [PERSON] feature or is third person completely personless? If we understand the author(s)' claims correctly, the data and the analysis in the paper side with accounts which postulate the presence of [PERSON] feature with (at least a class of) third person nominals. This is an important outcome, which needs to be emphasized; but in order to do so, the presentation of the data and the details of the analysis need to be further improved. Also, as mentioned in the comments, some of the notation in the trees needs further clarification. Another point that would need a more extensive discussion, in our view, is the problem of contact, which is touched on too briefly.

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

For example, important works part of the debate of whether third person nominals indicate complete absence of [PERSON] or, on the contrary, presence of [PERSON].

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]

NO