

Review of: "A Review of Prosody, Punctuation, and Dyslexia: Implications for the Use of Speech Technologies"

Rafi Saleh¹

¹ James Cook University of North Queensland

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Dear Author

Thank you very much for your work. I appreciate how you reviewed a variety of pertinent literature and thematically presented the key findings. Nevertheless, I have several concerns as listed below:

1. You did not discuss the process of selecting articles for this review. What were your criteria for inclusion and exclusion? While the majority of studies focused on dyslexic students, Heggie and Wade-Wolly (2018) and Calet et al. (2017) are examples of studies that did not focus on dyslexic students. Please consider discussing your methodology in this review paper.
2. You presented a collection of findings from existing literature but did not discuss how the scholars arrived at these conclusions. Furthermore, your review was mostly objective, with little or no critical analysis of the reported findings on your part. To put it another way, I didn't find much of your voice in this review article.
3. How did you come up with the themes? A thorough discussion of how you structured your review at the beginning of the article will assist readers in following through.

Apart from these pressing issues, please see my specific comments below:

Abstract:

Although you began the abstract with "dyslexic pupils tend to omit punctuation from their writing," you went on to discuss dyslexia, written prosody, spoken prosody, prosodic awareness, auditory processing, and more. Please consider rephrasing the first sentence to encompass all you addressed in this review.

Since the review is about prosody, it would be helpful for non-specialist readers to receive a concise explanation of the term.

Prosody, punctuation, and dyslexia:

The first paragraph was a bit challenging to follow. If the terms "phonological awareness" and "phonological processing" are not interchangeable, it would be helpful if you could draw a connection between them. A deeper level of discussion will assist clarify how visual processing, auditory processing, and working memories become the underlying cause of dyslexia if phonological processes are not the primary factor.

Also, please consider providing a brief discussion/introduction on Text-to-Speech before directing readers to other literature.

Elements of Prosody:

Well explained; however, a definition of "amplitude modulations" would be helpful.

Punctuation and Prosody:

What are garden-path sentences? Examples?

Prosodic Processing in Dyslexia:

Goswami et al.: Connection to punctuation is vaguely made. It could benefit from more explanation.

Sabisch et al (2006): What are ERPs? Consider using complete forms followed by acronyms.

This section would benefit from an outline of the studies discussed, as well as a summary of the overall findings and identified gaps. The findings are currently dispersed throughout.

Goswami (2019a): Consider explaining theta and delta bands.

You discussed auditory short-term memory. Should a discussion on long-term also be included for a complete grasp of the literature?

Prosodic training in Dyslexia:

Consider introducing the training at the beginning of this section.

Dyslexia and Speech Technology:

First paragraph: Consider providing sources to support the statements.

Third paragraph: "One factor to take into account"— where did you get this factor? Please provide a reference.

"Technical difficulties" and "continuous professional development" should be explained in more detail.

Implications for teaching:

2. I did not find much discussion on CALL in your review

3. Individual differences were also underrepresented in your review.

"Regarding CALL evaluation in particular"--- this paragraph should be moved to number 2.

I hope you find the suggestions helpful.