

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

Quang Nguyen

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

While other reviewers have already commented on the general details of this manuscript, I shall point out several critical points that the authors should think about:

1. Logic-wise, the general objective of this research is not convincing. It is agreeable that polysemes are important as a part of a language, but different than some hundred years ago, language coursebooks nowadays present words that are contextualized. It is quite normal that a content word may simply have one meaning in a specific instance. The coursebook designers in fact does not need to emphasize on different meanings of a words if these are irrelevant to the context of the lesson. The coursebook designers did not emphasize on polysemes, which may be even more helpful than presenting to many meanings, so that learners do not get confused with the new words they learn. And if we want the designers to focus more on polysemy that I doubt that there is any commonly used linguistic items (e.g content word) that is restricted to solely one meaning at all, which certainly will overload learners cognitive ability according to the limited cognitive resource theory.
2. The fact that you use British National Corpus to find out whether common words in coursebooks "are the most frequently used in English" overlooks the existence of World Englishes. Frankly speaking, The British National Corpus (BNC) is just a collection of samples designed to represent British English not American English, Australian English, Canadian English and the like.
3. Also, the author is too confident with what they know by presenting statements like "To date, there has been no attempt to investigate multi-word units and word senses in English textbooks." (A quick search on Google Scholar or Research Gate confirms something opposite) or "The knowledge of chunks and word multiple senses is as important as or even more important for language use than the knowledge of single words" (It is problematic when you jump to this conclusion because words with multiple meaning does not necessarily be treated differently from single words. In fact, they can be learned as single words with different meaning). or "This is because frequent words are more useful than less frequent words given that they are encountered more frequently and thus have a higher chance of being learned" (Even though ones may encounter a word more frequently, we cannot guarantee that these common words that he/she encounter are more useful than less common word. Word usefulness cannot be defined in such an over-simplified manner.
4. The literature review is underdeveloped. Actually, what the author did was just provide a definition of key terms. A literature review, indeed, has to conceptualize key terms, compare and point out the gap in literature, and provide a theoretical/conceptual framework as well.

5. The methodology section was not carefully written and the rationale for method choice was not clearly presented. For example, "To gather data for the current study, reliable instrumentation was employed." How do you know the instrumentation was reliable. In fact, by looking at the methodology section, I cannot find how the validity and reliability of this study can be assured.

For all I have mentioned, it is advisable that the author should consider restructure their study in a way that is more convincing and scientifically-sound.