

From: XPRAG2019 xprag2019@easychair.org
Subject: XPRAG2019 notification for paper 29
Date: 19. March 2019 at 08:42
To: Judith Tonhauser judith.tonhauser@ling.uni-stuttgart.de



Dear authors,

We are delighted to inform you that your paper "Higher-probability content is more projective than lower-probability content" has been accepted for a spoken presentation at XPrag2019. The reviews of your abstract are appended to this email. We received 126 submissions and have accepted 20 for talks and 55 for posters.

To confirm your participation, please upload the final (de-anonymised) version of your abstract to

<https://easychair.org/my/conference.cgi?conf=xprag2019>

as soon as possible (and by April 7th at the latest).

If you are unable to present your work, please contact us as soon as possible at xprag2019@gmail.com.

Note that talks will be 20 minutes + 10 minutes for questions.

We look forward to welcoming you to Edinburgh!

Hannah Rohde and Chris Cummins, XPrag2019 Programme Committee chairs

----- REVIEW 1 -----

PAPER: 29

TITLE: Higher-probability content is more projective than lower-probability content

AUTHORS: Judith Tonhauser and Judith Degen

Overall evaluation: 3 (strong accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

Nice, clear, adds to the important growing body of studies on what factors influence projectivity.

----- REVIEW 2 -----

PAPER: 29

TITLE: Higher-probability content is more projective than lower-probability content

AUTHORS: Judith Tonhauser and Judith Degen

Overall evaluation: 1 (weak accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

This is solid work. The results are somewhat derivative of Tonhauser et al.'s (2018) findings though. Therefore I only rate it as 'weak accept'.

----- REVIEW 3 -----

PAPER: 29

TITLE: Higher-probability content is more projective than lower-probability content

AUTHORS: Judith Tonhauser and Judith Degen

Overall evaluation: 2 (accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

The paper presents results that convincingly show that projection (from factives and similar non factives) is governed by Bayesian interpretation and that logical treatments are only a very inaccurate approximation. The result was likely, but not empirically proven. The paper therefore fills in an important gap in the literature.

----- REVIEW 4 -----

PAPER: 29

TITLE: Higher-probability content is more projective than lower-probability content

AUTHORS: Judith Tonhauser and Judith Degen

Overall evaluation: 2 (accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

The abstract presents an interesting study comparing how the content of the complement of three groups of attitude verbs —(i) factive

The abstract presents an interesting study comparing how the content of the complement of three groups of attitude verbs— (i) factive verbs, (ii) verbs that sometimes behave like factive verbs and (iii) non-factive verbs— projects depending on the subjective probability of the content of the complement. The results clearly support the idea that subjective probability is one of the influencing factors. The abstract nicely discuss how this finding can be modeled in some of the existing analysis of projective content.