

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

Wagdi Bin-Hady

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

The researcher greatly showed the gap in previous research and tried to shed light on the importance of his study. There are some violations that need fixation. They are:

1. In the key words (which is not listed as a section), first the author is required to list them alphabetically, and the last one should be separated into two or three keywords "The Affordances of Speech Technologies in the Classroom", not combination of more than two words are allowed to be a keyword.
2. The title introduction should be added unless the journal policy imposed such design.
3. In the use of intext citation
4. Page number is not required in (Kuhn et al., 2010, pp. 233-234); Triantafyllidou (2020, pp. 41-61), Kuhn et al. (2010, p. 235) unless a direct quotation is used. So omit the page number used along the paper unless you used it for a "direct quotation".
5. The use of (et al) should be utilized wherever is used.
6. The author used generalization like (Most studies agree that there are..), I think, it is not academic style to use such expressions. Try instead to say less general quantity expression like many, or some. Moreover, after such generalization, it is necessary to mention some studies to justify your claim.
7. Check the use of ampersand in (also Indal & Maveus (2019), Similarly, Caccia & Lorusso (2019) full and should be used instead. (and).
8. For demonstrating previous studies, author is required to use sample past instead of present (Similarly, Heggie and Wade-Woolley (2018) point out).
9. The figure used in Punctuation and Prosody section should be cited and title should be added.
10. It is better if the author ends the manuscript by a conclusion.