Dear Editor Cabrelli,

Thank you for your continued support for my revised manuscript. In this document, I address the outstanding changes that the reviewers have suggested. My responses to your comments are found in red below. I have also included changes in the manuscript in red. I look forward to advancing to publication and thank you warmly for your suggestions in the interest of strengthening the manuscript. With your permission, I have de-anonymized the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Patrick Thane

**Reviewer #1**

I appreciate the detail and precision that the author carried out revisions in this second round. In my opinion, I feel that the author sufficiently addressed the principle concerns expressed individually and collectively by the reviewers in this revised version, and I am happy to endorse this version for publication in LAB. My only suggestion for a relatively minor revision/adjustment prior to final submission is to take a close look at a recently published keynote in LAB by Lohndal & Putnam (2024). This manuscript (and the responses to this manuscript) advance the discussion of formal features beyond what these authors initial discuss in their 2021 article that you cite. I don't think this will radically affect your analysis (at all), but this updated reference may provide additional and more detailed insight for your position on features and the role they play in Putnam & Sánchez's (2013) model and related approaches.

Thank you for this proposed revision. Since I discuss feature-based accounts throughout my manuscript, it is indeed logical for me to incorporate this more recent approach that was published after the initial submission of this study. I have mentioned this paper in two places in my manuscript, as well as once in a footnote where I cite a specific component of the paper. I share the view that the Feature Reassembly Hypothesis need not posit novel mechanisms of structure building, but I do believe that this framework and its adaptation to HL acquisition and maintenance provide testable predictions (even if they are not predictions about structure building itself) that are useful for those of us who conduct experimental work and who wish to identify which factors can condition HL acquisition and maintenance.

**Reviewer #2**

Page 2, section 2, 2nd line: empiricalize > operationalize.

Corrected.

p. 9, 4 lines before the start of section 4: Only previous study > Only one previous study

Corrected.

p. 12: "Children in both schools were primarily of Mexican descent...": Do you mean participating children? If you are talking about the school generally you may want to mention that they are predominantly Latinx when you mention the school demographic reports.

Yes, participating children. I have clarified this.

Like I explained in my last review, this study is not an experiment. Please do not call it one. Similarly, I have doubts about using the term on the last line of p. 8: I know you're talking within the context of what has not happened yet, but it still does not sit well with me because no person could conduct a true experiment on this topic (e.g., children cannot be randomly selected into different home environments).

I have removed “experiment” from the manuscript.

Perhaps the editor and the other reviewers will disagree, but I see no need for Figure 2 when you already have Figure 1, especially considering the context that you are hitting your readers with 6 figures within 5 pages.

I have reduced Figures 1 and 2 to a single figure. I have opted for the boxplot graph because it shows the distribution of responses. This graph has been adjusted to represent the ratio of subjunctive responses versus previous responses. The previous graph did not appropriately report the distribution, as it counted N/A responses as non-subjunctive responses. This is now corrected.

**Reviewer #3**

Page 4: Perhaps you could point out the other language that is used in the DLI schools (i.e., ENG), just to set the scene – so far, it had not been mentioned that the Spanish HS are in an English setting.

In alignment with this and the previous comment, I have clarified in the introductory paragraph that this study evaluates Spanish HSs dominant in English. I have also included a reference on page 4 describing that DLI provides HSs with greater exposure to Spanish when compared to other HSs in traditional schools.

Page 5: Who are the "monolinguals" here? Spanish monolingual children? How then do HSs enrolled in DLI programs have more input in Spanish than monolingual Spanish peers (in Spanish schools, I assume?)? Or did I misunderstand this?

I have rephrased to indicate that HSs in DL schools have more exposure than those HSs who are educated monolingually in the dominant language, but not more than Spanish monolinguals.

Page 6: Introduce abbreviation?

Corrected.

Page 9: Something missing here?

Corrected.

Page 12: Indef. article correct?

Yes, as I am referring to a specific course.

Page 12: This, I think is the first mention of the setting of your study. Perhaps consider adding it earlier in your paper?

This is now addressed in the first paragraph.

Page 16: Preposition missing?

There is no preposition missing in the highlighted text.

Page 18: See his citation guidelines: 15. How do I cite the corpora in my published articles? Can I use screenshots from the corpora in my publication / presentation? Please use the following information when you cite the corpus in academic publications or conference papers.

I have made this adjustment throughout the manuscript.

Page 18: Perhaps use name of corpus instead?

Corrected.

Page 18: You keep using different terms: MLE school, English-only, monolingual (English school).... - perhaps select one of them consistently?

This is a good point. I have corrected to “monolingual English” to be consistent.

Page 21: It seems to me that 3 points are below 2, which would indicate a less frequent use? I think that jitter wouldn’t account for this here...

Thank you for your comment. In stating “Figure 6 illustrates that all HSs produced or selected the subjunctive in at least two contexts,” I imply that in total, each participant had 2 instances of subjunctive use. There are points on this graph in which some participants produced the subjunctive once and selected it once. To make this point clearer, I have rephrased this section to say “produced *and/or* selected.”

Page 27: I agree that language dominance plays an important role. But is this something you can confirm with your data? or how can you explain that the older students produced and selected more subjunctives? are these also the ones that are more dominant?

This is an insightful point. I added this reference per the recommendations of an additional reviewer, but since I do not directly address language dominance, I am not sure if its inclusion is appropriate here. I have opted to remove this information.

Page 29: This is interesting and also something that should be investigated further, not in your study, of course, but in general, a sort of assessment of DLI schools.

I fully agree. My colleagues and I plan to carry out observations of DLI schools in the near future. We have not yet developed a set of questions to investigate, so I have chosen not to add that future research is underway in this area.

Page 29: I believe that this is an important point, which has also been shown in the literature. Could this perhaps be strengthened?

Yes. I have added a reference to Montrul and Perpiñán (2011), who have shown this with the subjunctive.

Page 30: Please check and correct.

Corrected.

Page 31: Definite article missing?

I do not believe there is an article missing in this instance as it refers to findings in general.

Page 33: Please check hyperlink – it didn’t work for me.

I have tested this hyperlink and it did function for me. Here is a screenshot:
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