

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

Peter Docherty

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a rudimentary study which compares two corpora and finds that some words are used in both corpora. Some of those words are also polysomous. There is no frequency data to speak of. There are no teaching implications. Figure 1 contains no data.

This is what ChatGPT responds with after reading the methodology (I agree fully with it):

Methodology Problems:

1. Limited sample size of two textbooks: The methodology is based on two textbooks and therefore may not be representative of the wider population of English textbooks used in non-native English contexts.
2. Limited scope of analysis: The study focuses on the top 100 most frequently used words in each of the two textbooks and does not take into account the less common words that may also be polysemous.
3. Relying solely on Sketch Engine and WordNet: The study relies solely on two tools, Sketch Engine and WordNet, which may not provide enough detail or accuracy in the analysis of polysemy and frequency of words.

ChatGPT also stated the reasearch could be improved by:

1. Increase sample size: The methodology should be expanded to include more than two textbooks to provide a more representative sample of English textbooks used in non-native English contexts.
2. Expand scope of analysis: The analysis should extend beyond the top 100 most frequently used words in each of the two textbooks, and include a broader range of words, including less common words that may be polysemous.

I add:

3. Provide detailed frequency data on the various senses as well as the word (and word class).
4. Provide implications: The study should include additional peadagogical implications to provide a more detailed and accurate analysis of polysemy and frequency of words and how students should be taught their various meanings.

