Review of: "Are non-native speakers' English pronunciation similar?: Evidence through PRAAT recording software"

Ramon Brena[1]

1 Tec de Monterrey

There are several shortcomings in this article –I suggest to take care of them.

One is that you present but fail to explain lots of terms in the introduction; for instance, I found "Conceptualizer, the Formulator, and the Articulator" where you fail to explain what these terms are and why they are relevant to the paper. Other terms are introduced by the author similarly without any explanation, like "speaker's mental wordbook" (?) as if the terms were self-evident.

There are some structural drawbacks to the paper as well. The introduction should first motivate why is important what this paper tries to establish, but we find instead a detailed revision of prior work, which should belong to a state-of-the-art section. Similarly, in sections 2.1 and 2.2, we find information related to the cultural context of China and Bangladesh, which clearly shouldn't be in that section; it could be useful in the introduction or else be eliminated completely.

Later in the introduction, we find the phrase "To find the answer to the research objectives…" but no clear objectives have been established.

You have to assume that we don't know the PRAAT software and explain its characteristics accordingly, which you don't do.

There are too many ill-constructed English phrases like "…a good way to identify the exact result" but without telling the result of what. Other phrases are grammatically correct but put in a way that can't be used for a scientific paper, like in "Precisely, this program is the most flexible program to analyze human sound and speech." because this is a subjective evaluation that cannot be "precise." Another example of a subjective statement is "…even though it lost its glory."

You cannot write as you speak. Each and every sentence have to be correctly constructed, which is not the case in the paper. For instance, you write, "Finally, the political factor." There is not a verb in this sentence, so it's not well constructed.

In section 3.4, it appears that there are only 2 participants in the study, but it's not clearly stated.

Now, about the research methods, I don't see conclusive evidence just using the waveforms of the pronunciation. I think you have to do additional analysis using a derived feature, like, for instance, using the MFCC (Mel Frequencies Cepstral Coefficient) or an equivalent tool.

If this were a regular conference paper, no doubt I'd have rejected it.

There are some pitfalls in the research itself, but most of them are about how it's reported. You have to pay attention closely to the way the paper is written.