

Pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics patterns of requestive acts in English and Italian: insights from film conversation

As a result of the revision, the paper has gained in precision. The literature review and theoretical basis are a good point of departure for the empirical section of the paper. In particular, the addition of the section on politeness theory has contributed to the comprehension of the paper. The method section is now transparent and easy to follow due to the revision. The empirical analyses are clearly structured and comprehensibly argued. To bring the paper to publication, the following is a few brief comments for improvement:

1. On page 4, line 5 the author says that “As far as we are aware, this is the first study which investigates pragmatic phenomena in film speech from a cross-linguistic perspective”. This assertion is not correct, I recommend the author to check the studies carried out by Pinto (2010, 2022).

>We actually meant cross-cultural comparisons between film dialogues in different languages, not from a translational perspective, which is the field that the reviewers' citations refer to. Translation actually abounds in studies, but no one has been carried out, always to our knowledge, taking into account two languages separately. However, we made this point even clearer if you see the manuscript.

2. At the end of the section 2.1 Politeness theory the reasons given by the authors about the selection of the B&L's model are not quite strong. They said that they are not analyzing the different levels of politeness; however, they are examining the correlation between directness and politeness. They should give stronger reasons why this model was selected despite the main criticisms. If the authors want to use this politeness theory, they should provide a better argument, probably mention the attention to social distance and power.

>Perhaps the reviewer meant Sec. 2.3? We now clarified the fact that the reason why the model was used was its strong focus on social distance, compared to others. Also, a few lines above this new modification, we mentioned many studies that revealed the correlation between distance and politeness, and which were based on B&L. We highlighted the whole piece of text in yellow so that the reviewer can see all the reasons we provided why the model was chosen although others, more modern but not as fit, were available.

3. It is necessary to clarify more the following aspect “In this respect, the present research centred on film conversation lends support to the long-standing argument, pioneered by Brown and Levinson (1978), that social distance and (im)politeness go hand in hand.” The authors should provide a stronger argument.

- This is the conclusion part, where we simply meant that if intensifiers and mitigators can be a means through which (im)politeness surfaces, the correlation between them and social distance, found in the study, indicates that the two are correlated. The investigation thus aligns with previous studies, always based on B&L and mentioned immediately before, which point to such correlation . We rephrased this: “This finding leads to the speculation that requestive mitigators and intensifiers may be employed (among other things) to realize facework and (im)politeness, two types of linguistic conduct heavily influenced by social distance (Baxter, 1984; Holtgraves, 1986; Slugoski and Turnbull, 1988; Spencer-Oatey, 1996; Márquez-Reiter, 2000; Fukushima 2003; Rue and Zhang, 2008), as initially posited by Brown and Levinson (1978).” We hope that, in this way, we made it clear what we meant by “go hand in hand”.