

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

Chiara Meluzzi¹

¹ University of Milan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic is really interesting and the suggested analysis has good intentions and potential. However, there are many issues regarding this work at the present state. From a stylistic perspective, there are quite a number of colloquial expressions, which sound out of place in a scientific article. Some declarations are, moreover, quite obvious and inadequate for a research paper, resembling more a student's essay during class. I'm referring to expressions like "An allophone is a phonetic variant of a phoneme in a given language", with a reference to Britannica: allophones is (one of the) core topic of phonology, and simply reducing it to a sentence and a reference to Britannia seems a bit odd for a scientific article. Furthermore, it is not explained why the notion of allophone could be of interest in the research at present.

Second, the structure of the paper is not clear. The introduction presents some sentences copied-and-pasted from the abstract (or the other way round, but the results is the same), and it seems to include also the results of the research. I suggest to move the research questions and hypothesis in the introduction, by leaving aside the rest. Prior research should be included in the literature review, which should not include specific mentions of the software used. These information should go in the methodological section, and I also suggest the author to make less obvious statements in this section (e.g., the explanation of what a research protocol is) and to focus more in explaining his/her own work.

Results are scarcely presented and the feel is that of an impressionistic analysis. Moreover, phonemic and phonetic transcription given at pages 9 and 10 seemed not to make use of IPA symbols (or to make an odd use of them), so they are not self-explanatory of the point to be made. Given this poor analysis, the discussion provided is not supported by the results presented. For instance, the author states that "two speakers' phonological aspiration are not similar", but this assumption seems to be based on the visual inspection on the waveform and on a couple of Herz values without clarifying the number of tokens or what this values are actually measuring and how they have been extracted.

Therefore, despite the interesting topic, the article needs to be seriously improved both in the form and in the presented content.