

Review of: "A Corpus Analysis of Polysemy in CEFR-based English Textbooks"

Jiun-lung Lei¹

¹ Central Taiwan University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

No prior effort has been made to explore polysemy in English textbooks used in non-native English contexts, hence the subject of the research is noteworthy. Nevertheless, I detected several confusing points in it. Firstly, despite the fact that the paper intends to explore the prototype and peripheral senses of the most prevalent polysemous terms in the selected English textbooks, its findings do not give any information about the words' peripheral senses. In its findings and discussion section, there was no mention of the term peripheral.

Furthermore, despite the level difference, 65 of the top 100 most-used words in *Close-up* and *Full Blast Plus 4* overlapped. The author claimed that there was a deficiency in the chosen English textbooks' coverage of word multiple meanings and, by extension, contextual variety. This conclusion might be misleading. The top 100 most-used words in both textbooks are common, fundamental English words. It is quite probable that these fundamental words have a narrower variety of meanings compared to more complex words. This statistic may merely reflect the real number of high-frequency basic English words in everyday conversation and not a lack in the textbooks. If the author wishes to investigate the incorporation of polysemy in the chosen English textbooks, he may choose items outside the top 100.