

# Review of: "Signatures in mediumnic automatic writing - a pilot exploration of the resemblance with the deceased's handwriting"

Masayuki Ohkado

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article sheds a new light on mediumistic studies and has a great potential to expand their horizons.

(A) The argument will become more convincing if the medium's usual handwritings are provided so that the reader will see the difference between them and those in Figure 1.

(B) Also, it will be nice if the author applies some of the handwriting analyses provided in the articles referred to in the references. For instance, applying Desai & Kalyan (2013)'s analyses (in terms of MOVMENT, LOOPS, ALIGNMENT, T-CROSSING AND I-DOT, etc.) to assess the medium's handwritings in comparison with the deceased will deepen the argument of the article.

(C) The author refers to Sudduth (2009). But for the argument pertinent to the article, Braude (2003) and Sudduth (2016) should also be referred to.

Braude, S. (2003) *Immortal Remains*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Sudduth, M. (2016) *A Philosophical Critique of Empirical Arguments for Postmortem Survival*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Minor points on styles:

(1) The last line of the first paragraph in the "Introduction": Could it not be possible to provide some sources of the "Brazilian press media"?

(2) Isn't "in" in the last line of the first paragraph of the "Result" "as"?

(3) In the second line of the paragraph starting with "Although" in the "Discussion", "the English idiom" sounds strange to me. Is it "the English language"?

(4) In the third line of the paragraph starting with "For fairness" in the "Discussion", the "compose the spirit" does not seem to make sense.

(5) In the last line of the paragraph starting with "For fairness" in the "Discussion", although the author says that "this thought could not even be a hypothesis," the thought can be regarded as a hypothesis, depending on the definition. The

author should be clearer in what sense he/she says so.

(6) In the fifth line of the paragraph starting with "This study" in the "Disucssion", is the usage of "casuistry" correct?

(7) In the eighth line of the paragraph starting with "This study" in the "Disucssion", should'nt "the differential" in "a significant differential" be "different"?

(8) I don't think Dranca (2017) in the references is not referred to in the text.