Comments for Eileen

Paper Comments:
Overall I thought her paper was professional and well composed. I do not know much about stress patterns, but the way she set-up her paper made it easy to follow and understand the purpose of her analysis. I did not have much constructive criticism, but I took many notes for my own work.

I learned a lot about empirical writing from reading her paper. Her explanations were clear, and the kind of information she provided seem to enough to inform the reader and make it reproducible, without being overwhelming .

Intro/Abstract Comments:
* Excellent introduction and abstract - I like how she outlined very specifically what the purpose of this particular paper is. I think that in my own work that is something I should take into consideration, instead of trying to capture all the generalizations related to the work that I am analyzing. I though it made it very clear what her intentions were.
* I also thought the description of what she found at the end of her intro was a good way to jump start into her methods.

Methods Comments:
* The description of her participant was great. This seems especially important considering it was single participant and he had a speech impediment. Addressing and explaining the impediment was important in understanding and interpreting her results later on.
* I see that she mentioned future work in the participant section. At first this felt odd, and I was not sure whether this was common practice. I think a better option would have been to recap this information in the conclusion and mentioned its relevance there.

Stimuli:
* Very well described. I like that she presented the tables directly in the stimuli section. I am not sure if manuscript APA style requires tables and figures at the end? But I think this is much more clear way to present the information
* Also, when she mentioned Table 1(a) Table 1(b) and Table 1(c), I was looking for three separate tables. I think it would be more clear if she separated the different tables with APA style lines, or collapsed over one table.

Procedure:
* I like that she mentioned that the target words were produced phrase-medially to avoid phrase final lengthening. I thought this detail was very important and overall demonstrates that her experimental design was extremely well thought through.
*Her description of vowel measurement is also very helpful for me. This is the first time I formalized measurements of vowel duration, and I see some things that she included that I should have included in my paper as well, such as the upswing and downswing of the non-deformed period.

Analysis/Results Comments:
* As I mentioned above, I like that she discusses her previous analysis that she conducted on this data. I think it really drives the point home as to why we took this class!
* Overall great interpretation of the results and honest reporting of committing a Type 1 error
* I like that she mentioned the structure of her data frame. This is helpful for reproducing as well as underlying the interaction between her variables (i.e. why word needed to be a random factor)
* Her results were nicely organized; I like that she separated her different predictions out in her analysis. It made it easy to follow what she found and then how she interpreted the findings.
* I believe p values should be italicized in APA. Also, this is just a personal preference, but I think it looks cleaner if state p values as $p < .001$ instead of $p = 2.9996e\text{-}12$.

Discussion:
* I have never seen a paper in which they refer to themselves (i.e. Blum 2018) when discussing her findings. I was just curious whether this was a stylistic preference or a formatting preference.
 * Perhaps Eileen mentioned this and I missed it, but I was wondering what the 0 and 1 represent for the stress?
* I would suggest that when she describes a figure, it would be nice to have that figure close to the description, instead of spread out. For instance, I think it would make her paper even better if Fig. 3 was in the results section and not in the discussion. Same goes for all Figures she presented.

Lastly,
* She mentioned that her participants fricatives were impaired, and how this may impact the generalization of her findings. I would like to know more about in what ways this could impact the vowels? It may be interesting to mentioned this in the discussion and how productions from a participant without a cleft palate may be different.

Script comments:
*I like that she had separate scripts for everything: her plots tidying her data, models, etc. I think this makes it look very clean, and also easier to edit later!
* Her scripts are clean and reproducible and very organized as well

Slide comments:
* I would love to see an update version of her slides since the class presentation; she really got so much work done it is pretty awesome. Especially all of the graphs that she has under the plot section
* Maybe she has an updated version and I missed? I would love to check it out if she did.

Comments for Jessyca

Paper comments:
This was a fun paper to read: it was clear, well thought through , reproducible and she clearly presented the implications of her findings. I am also interested in acoustic cues that speakers utilize in speech perception so this provided some interesting insight into that.

Introduction:
For her Hume and Johnson (1999) citation, I would suggest generating a new sentence here. Saying something like "This question was adopted from research by Hume and Johnson (1999)" or something to make it flow a bit better.

Methods:
*She mentioned that participants varied in proficiency and I am curious to know how proficiency was measured. This might be something interesting to mentioned because different measures/ different tests can give different information about proficiency.
* I like that she gave a detailed explanation of why she chose the words that she did. When she mentioned English violations, what kind of violations is she referring to? I am curious to know in reference to my own work as well (Pg 3)
* I think it would be helpful for the reader if she defined oxytone, paraoxytone either in the introduction or in her stimuli section where she talks about it.
* I would also like to know more about the impact of duration and intensity. She mentioned that the words had a variety of durations and intensities but that she only focus on duration and intensity of 0. I would like to know more about this.
*Nice inclusion of the detail that the words were said in isolation, and why this is important

Procedure:
* Really good description overall. I found that her description made it easy to reproduce the work that she did - a very important aspect of research! Thought she nailed this part.
* Quick q: was the screen presentation randomized? Perhaps she mentioned this and I missed, but I was wondering if the words randomly appeared on either the left or right side of the screen, or if they appear 50% on the right and 50% on the left, for instance? I do not think this is a major factor, but I do know that people tend to look left -> right on a computer screen in these types of experiments. That makes me think... collecting eye gaze data might be an interesting addition, as well as maybe RT.

Results:
* Very clear results section. I like how she include how she coded the variables and mentioned that she centered proficiency
* Again, I believe in APA format, the p in the p-value should be italicized (i.e. p <.001). But now I am starting to wonder as this is the second paper I read in which the p-value was not italicized.
* I thought it was important that she mentioned how the interpretation of main effects is influenced by the interaction. I would like to know a bit more about the consequences of this.
* Wow to that R value, that is awesome! Inclusion of beta weights and confidence intervals aided in the interpretation of her results.
Discussion/Conclusion:

* Overall, I thought she did a great job interpretating of her results. I think it was clear she understood her analyses and the implications of her results
* I was particularly interested in her theoretical OT perspective. Mentioning the potential hierarchy was interesting because it highlighted an important aspect of OT (that underlying forms do not have stress) so I thought it was cool that an acoustic correlate (i.e. syllable weight) that could be analyzed from this perspective.
* I thought her interpretation that phonological structure of language influences speech perception was interesting and definitely spot on. I would like to know more about what she mean when she mentioned phonological structure. In other words, what is the phonological structure for Spanish, English and what does she predict the structure to be for dominant Spanish vs dominant English speakers? This would be an interesting addition for the conclusion or future directions.

Script comments:
* She commented about whether she dummy coded correctly or not. I have never done it myself but I thought the code looked good. I also found another way to do using the dummy.code() function, which seems to be popular.
* She mentioned that she see clustering on the left side in her homoskedasticity plot and commented that perhaps this has to with interactions. The fan pattern occurs when the size of the error term is different for different values/levels of the IV right? Idk why that type of clustering would occur. I am not sure if this is has to do with interactions, but I would like to look into this.
* Her code is clear and clean and to the point. I like how she commented as she went along. I think she keep track of things nicely that way.
*I see she in her code she used a Gaussian distribution, maybe it would be a good to include this in manuscript?

Slide comments:
 *Her slides look nice, I like that she include code in them - I would suggest putting warning=FALSE in her code, so those pesky warnings don't show up on the slides themselves.
* Nice plot to show her interaction! I would suggest playing around with the size of the axes so she can see them better. I have never done this myself either, but sent her an R tutorial about just general R graphing: https://www.statmethods.net/advgraphs/parameters.html
^^ Not sure how it translates if she use xaringan (as in it might not be directly reproducible)
* Overall, her slides look awesome and clean. I like her side-by side comparisons that she use to demonstrate normality.