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

Carla María Míguez Álvarez[1]

1 Universidad de Vigo

The study presents a review of the existing literature regarding the relationship between dyslexia and prosody and the use of speech technologies. Although an interesting topic, I would like to address several points:

1. Your study is very difficult to follow since you focused on too many topics at once. In fact, you should focus only on the relationship between prosody and reading and how punctuation is thrown into the mix. More investigations with non-dyslexic children and adults are also needed to allow comparisons to be made.

2. The paper lacks a section explaining the hypotheses of this work and also of the methodology used to select and analyze the papers.

3. The section *Elements of Prosody* is too brief: two paragraphs are not enough to explain all that prosody entails. I would also include prosodic awareness since it is a fundamental element of reading development that could be related to dyslexia cases and you mention it later. In addition, Fodor's implicit prosody hypothesis is much more complex than stated, therefore a paragraph should be devoted to this theory.

4. I have noticed that you mix research conducted with samples from different language backgrounds, regardless of the degree of transparency of their languages. However, languages also differ in their prosody (stress-timed/syllable-timed disparities), therefore the implications of prosody in reading and in dyslexia could be different (and could, in turn, affect prosodic training).

5. You claim that "English is a language characterized by a fluid punctuation system", but you do not provide any source. What is the difference between the punctuation used in English in comparison to a more transparent language or a language that uses a different transcript?

6. I find the section *Prosodic Processing in Dyslexia* very weak. You mention a lot of research that has almost nothing to do with each other (phonological awareness and prosody, prosody and syntax and prosodic awareness and punctuation; dyslexic samples with non-dyslexic samples) and the information you provide about each study is quite scarce. In addition, it would be helpful to include a table comparing the characteristics of the studies mentioned: number of participants, age, language(s) spoken, type of dyslexia, tasks used, etc.

7. The section *Dyslexia and Speech Technologies* should be part of the section *Prosodic Training in Dyslexia.* I also recommend to add another table with more information about the studies: number of participants, age, language(s) spoken, type of dyslexia, tasks used during training, etc.

8. In my opinion, the last paragraph of the section *Dyslexia and Speech Technologies* is off-topic and only causes confusion.

9. In the abstract you say you will talk about "recent neurocognitive findings" but you did not include these findings in the *Prosodic Training in Dyslexia* section.

10. In order to sustain the implications included in the section *Implications for teaching* you need the previous sections to be stronger. In fact, in this section you mention for the first time important topics such as individual differences and the evaluation of tools used in assessment.

Unfortunately, I do not support this article for publication even with major revisions, but I highly encourage the author to continue research on this topic and to submit new investigations.