

Referee's report on "This is the way people are negative anymore: Mapping emotionally negative affect in syntactically positive *anymore* through sentiment analysis of tweets"

Overall, I thought this was a good paper. It employs a novel corpus that provides a kind of data that cannot be elicited, as the authors note. The sentiment analysis is also novel. I agree with the authors' contention that some kinds of syntactic features require this kind of corpus and analysis in order to be discerned. The authors have clearly forged new ground in this study.

I have relatively few comments on this paper, which I found to be well written. The background research appears impressively thorough. The connection between positive *anymore* and complaining is interesting, and reminds us that people certainly like to complain a lot.

Content

The first paragraph of §1.1 characterizes negative polarity items. One point I notice is that the examples the authors provide are cases that involve the negator, *not*. There are also, however, cases that involve negative prefixes, as suggested by an essay that's been floating around the internet for years and that notes that one does not hear people being described as "ruly, peccable, or combobulated."

Some additional explanation of the scales introduced in lines 298-300 may be called for. In particular, I didn't understand how the strong-weak axis was assessed—that is, what makes a statement relatively strong or weak? The examples in ll. 524-25 didn't clarify this at all. Obviously, a reader's understanding of the entirety of §3.3 rests on whether they can make sense of how "strong" and "weak" (or "dominant" and "submissive") translate to actual utterances.

Writing Mechanics

- l. 17: "dialectologically" should be "dialectally"
- l. 195: It'd be better to change "But" to "However," especially with the "but" in the preceding sentence
- l. 217: "racetrack" is normally spelled as one word
- l. 224: "undermines" should be "undermine," since its subject is "mismatches"
- l. 282: "platforms" should be "platform's"
- l. 344: It might sound better to replace "occurring" with "coinciding"
- l. 393: I can't find a sentence 9a anywhere—just a sentence 9 and a sentence 9b.
- l. 465: There's no sentence 2a above—just a sentence 2 and a sentence 2b.
- l. 470: "vader" looks like it's supposed to be set in all capitals
- l. 780: This makes me wonder why researchers don't gloss NPAM as "these days," which I think is more common in conversational usage than "nowadays."
- ll. 863 ff: The authors might want to check to make sure that the style used in *Languages* doesn't capitalize all content words in book titles.
- l. 1013: "yyes" should be "types"