* I wouldn’t have citations in the abstract.
* I also wouldn’t have a quotation in the abstract.
* Why have you abbreviated the word experiment in the abstract? It doesn’t change your word count.
* The example sentence at the beginning of the paper seems weird, possibly because the indention seems off. Maybe revise. Also why is oxygen capitalized? What is the simple Wikipedia parenthetical about?
* Put your in-text citations at the end of the sentences, as opposed to the middle of sentences, when you can.
* You could use line edits throughout the paper, but it is a PDF so I didn’t use track-changes
* Is it standard to abbreviate a citation? I don’t think I’ve seen it before.
* I would avoid starting paragraphs with a citation. The first sentence of a paragraph is an opportunity to tell your reader, in your own words/theory, what you want them to know.
* I see why you quoted the title of the CBG article but I think it would read more formally if you just state it in your own words
* I think the replication with small children should be in the text as opposed to being a footnote.
* I understand that there will be a lot of jargon that I won’t understand but I feel that it is still unnecessary or worth describing at times. For example, what do you mean when you say “priors” in your intro? That could mean a number of things.
* With some citations, I am not sure of the relevance or get lost. For example, when you bring up RSA, I kind of know why, but by the end of the paragraph, I am at a loss. Why are you bringing up other linguistic phenomena? Why are you giving specific examples if they are ultimately tangential?
* Can you move your equation to after you describe them? That may just be a personal thing though.
* At one point you say that only adult female birds lay eggs. Later you say that about 50% of birds lay eggs. The latter does not seem to be accurate. I know this is beside your point but it is something that comes to mind.
* 2 sections flow very well for me even the labeling of sections for this publication confuse me. Though does 40 participants provide sufficient power for this experimental design, even though it is within subjects? It seems low… Though, I generally tend to be hesitant with sample sizes when they are unknown MTurkers
* Sometimes you are too specific. For example, your reader doesn’t need a parenthetical that states that materials are in the appendix of a cited publication. I think it is sufficient to just cite the publication.
* I think you could use like one more sentence at the end of results sections to serve as a discussion. Tell your reader what you just found that relates to your overall theory.
* I like how your experimentation goes through the logic in both directions.
* How do you know that all of your participants are native English speakers? Again, it may just be me but I’m typically skeptical of MTurk.
* Your schematic model made your theory more confusing than less confusing for me. I think it is the symbols (e.g., S1, L1, and what the outputs mean). When I think of schematics, I think I off models that are incredible simple and straight forward such that if I saw it on its own, I could parse out its meaning.
* I don’t know Bayesian so I can’t help with that…
* I can figure out your color scheme in Figure 6. I think I like how you do it. I can see how others might not like it though.
* Why is there a discussion for some results but not others?
* When you say things like “bimodal,” can you spell out your meaning to the reader (from beginning of experiment 2)?
* Experiment 2: is 30 participants per cell sufficient?
* Good job with the intro to 4.3. It’s good how you tie together your findings in a way that helps the reader to predict what you’re going to cover next and why.
* It may be just me (like I may have missed something) but your accidental properties portion of the paper seems to come out of no where.
* Is CBG’s work, the only relevant work? It just seems that most, if not all, of your experimentation is based off of that work. That could lead certain journals (maybe not the one where you intend to submit) to think your work is too narrow.
* Later experiments (e.g., 4a) seem like they could use at least a little more introduction. Tell us why you’re testing what you’re testing and what your hypothesis is.
* The first sentence of your general discussion doesn’t exactly make sense. Can a model take something? And can it take something as vague? Maybe you just need a different word for “take.”
* The third sentence is a run-on sentence.
* The third paragraph doesn’t seem to flow from the previous paragraphs. You may just want to add another first sentence or just use consistent languge. Qualitative vs. quantitative (and italicized) threw me off.