Supplementary material 1.
The definitions of common dependency relations from [https://universaldependencies.org/en/dep/](https://universaldependencies.org/en/dep/). See the link for the full list of abbreviations.

**Table S1.** The abbreviation list of common English dependency relations and their definitions

| Abbreviation | Description |
|--------------|-------------|
| nsubj        | nominal subject | A nominal subject is a nominal which is the syntactic subject and the proto-agent of a clause |
| nsubjpass    | passive nominal subject | A passive nominal subject is a noun phrase which is the syntactic subject of a passive clause |
| obj          | object | The object of a verb is the second most core argument of a verb after the subject. |
| iobj         | indirect object | The indirect object of a (verbal) predicate is the nominal which is the dative object of the verb |
| ccomp        | clausal complement | A clausal complement of a verb or adjective is a dependent clause with an internal subject which functions like an object of the verb or adjective. |
| xcomp        | open clausal complement | An open clausal complement of a verb or an adjective is a predicative or clausal complement without its own subject |
| acl          | clausal modifier of noun | Clausal modifier of a noun is used for finite and non-finite clauses that modify a noun. |
| acl:relcl    | relative clause modifier | A relative clause modifier of a noun is a relative clause modifying the noun |
| nmod         | nominal modifier | The nominal modifier relation is used for nominal modifiers of nouns or clausal predicates |
| amod         | adjectival modifier | An adjectival modifier of a nominal is any adjective or adjectival phrase that serves to modify the meaning of the nominal |
| det          | determiner | A determiner is the relation between the head of an NP and its determiner |
| case         | case marking | The case relation is used for any preposition in English |
| advcl        | adverbial clause modifier | An adverbial clause modifier is a clause which modifies a verb or other predicate (adjective, etc.), as a modifier not as a core complement |
| neg          | negation modifier | The negation modifier is the relation between a negation word and the word it modifies |
| aux          | auxiliary | An aux (auxiliary) of a clause is a function word associated with a verbal predicate that expresses categories such as tense, mood, aspect, voice or evidentiality |
| root         | root | The root grammatical relation points to the root of the sentence |
**Table S2. Multinomial logistic regressions to classify each of the four groups with leave-one-out cross-validation**

| #  | Model                                      | classification accuracy, AIC of the model | classification accuracy, AIC of the model adding sentence length as a predictor | classification accuracy, AIC of the model adding sentence length and word frequency as predictors |
|----|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | subtype ~ sentence length                   | 55%, 270                                 | -                                                                              | 67%, 188                                                                                      |
| 2  | subtype ~ maximum incomplete dependencies  | 53%, 294                                 | 58%, 269                                                                       | 68%, 190                                                                                      |
| 3  | subtype ~ POS entropy                       | 51%, 292                                 | 61%, 223                                                                       | 66%, 180                                                                                      |
| 4  | subtype ~ dependency distance               | 52%, 298                                 | 58%, 264                                                                       | 67%, 191                                                                                      |
| 5  | subtype ~ noun/(noun + verb)                | 50%, 312                                 | 67%, 242                                                                       | 76%, 184                                                                                      |
| 6  | subtype ~ syntax frequency                  | 49%, 295                                 | 59%, 236                                                                       | 67%, 189                                                                                      |

AIC is reported for each model.
Supplementary material 3. The filtering process for the audio transcripts

We followed the CHAT Transcription Format (1); some details of that format are missing (e.g., which words and markers fall into each category) so we elaborate all of what we did, so that others can follow the same procedure later.

The following categories were automatically removed from utterances and further analyses.
- Conjunctions at the beginning of an utterance and the following starters (2, 3): “And”, “But”, “Well”, “Ok”, “Yeah”
- Disfluencies (1): “uh” and “um”

The following categories were manually removed from utterances and further analyses.
- Fillers or idiosyncratic discourse markers: “I mean”, “I don’t know” (4); “you know” (1)
- Word level repetitions (5)
- Comments about the task such as “this is difficult” (3)
- Direct answers to questions (2) or any utterances that are cued by the examiner (3)
- Meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic comments such as “I can’t recall this”, “I think so” (5, 6)
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