The current version of the article represents a significant improvement from the previous version. All the issues that I pointed out then have been addressed to my satisfaction, and I therefore recommend that it be accepted for publication. In particular, I appreciated the degree to which the authors have streamlined their prose and polished the overall organization of the paper, which is now considerably easier to follow.

Nevertheless, there are two issues that I think deserve some discussion. None of them is necessary for publication, but it'd be interesting if the authors could perhaps provide some broad discussion of these in the final part of the paper, perhaps replacing the discussion of inter-speaker variation, which I didn't find particularly informative. First, what is the role of evaluativity *per se* in determining the observed pattern — especially as it relates to gradability more broadly? As far as I understand, the authors discuss the semantics of the evaluativity only in terms of a relation between two degrees — the one instantiated by an individual and at the one associated with a contextual standard. While I assume this approach is feasible to capture the semantics of evaluativity, note that a very similar semantics applies to gradable adjectives more broadly. What about *fast* for example*?*

(1) Mary wasn't fast to grab the glass before it fell.

Is the sentence above grammatical in the first place? If so, what is its projectivity profile? Is it as discourse-sensitive as the one of *smart* or *stupid?* Note that *fast* might still be construed as evaluative, though it doesn't seem to be of the same kin as the adjectives tested in the experiment —at the very least, it encodes a mono-dimensional core, contrary to the multi-dimensional nature of the adjectives discussed in the paper. In any case, it would be nice to provide some discussion — and minimally to describe how the authors went about determining the evaluative status of the attributes tested in the study.

Second, what implications do these results have for the study of presupposition projection more generally? It seems like the approach advocated by the author — which crucially suggests that projection is better captured as a discourse-level phenomenon than a lexical one — could have serious implications for the account of other instances of projectivity above and beyond the domain of evaluative adjectives. This is obviously outside the scope of the paper, and thus I'm not expecting the authors to address the issue in an exhaustive manner. Nevertheless, it might be interesting to at least make some suggestive comments as to whether the discourse-sensitivity of projectivity is limited to the phenomenon considered in the paper, or extends more broadly.