

# Peer Review Comments

**Article:** Maciejewski, G and Klepousniotou, E 2016 Relative Meaning Frequencies for 100 Homonyms: British eDom Norms. *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, 4: e6, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jopd.28>

**Article submitted:** 22 June 2016

**Article accepted:** 24 October 2016

**Article published:** 06 December 2016

**Editor:** Jelte M. Wicherts

---

**Reviewer A:** Blair Armstrong

**Review Completed:** 24 July 2016

Summary

The authors report British English relative meaning frequency ratings collected using the eDom norming procedure for 100 homonyms selected based on linguistic, psycholinguistic, and lexicographic constraints. These norms can facilitate studies of lexical ambiguity in particular dialects and of cross-dialectal variability in English.

Assessment

The norms and associated procedure were collected in a rigorous fashion. The methods build upon the previously published eDom norms and methods, which should facilitate cross-norm comparisons, and also add in several additional new constraints that could further inform the literature. I expect that these norms will be of wide use to researchers studying semantic ambiguity in British English and cross-dialectal variations in ambiguity.

The reported work is consistent with all of the criteria for publication in the *Journal of Open Psychology Data*, including the replication of the data, the description of the data, and the potential applications of the data. The data have also been made available in a publically accessible format and in accordance with standard ethical principles. My only major comment is that the script itself for running the norming procedure online has not been made available. This would be useful to facilitate such online ratings in the future by this research group or other research groups (barring this, some screenshots would be useful).

I have only a few minor suggestions to expand the clarity and utility of these norms:

- the population used to norm the items is quite diverse, representing a broad cross-section of age and geographic location. It would be useful to report in some detail how stable the norms were across this group, or if there was some meaningful clustering based on these variables (e.g., because some words are used differently in different regions of the UK or in different age groups).
- Related to the issue of variability, it would be useful to report a general measure of inter-rater reliability in the norms for norm reliability comparisons, given that the main norming study was run online as opposed to in the laboratory (where the original eDom study was run). Currently, only the inter-rater agreement on the relatedness between the additional (participant-generated) ratings and presented ratings is provided.
- it is not clear why some words that were exclusively British (e.g., "chap" denoting a man) were excluded from the norms, or how "exclusively British" was operationalized. Would those items not be useful in highlighting cross-dialectal variability, especially given that they have been used in previous studies?
- what does it mean that "Overall, the stimuli were homogenous with respect to 14 lexical and semantic variables"? There appears to be considerable variability across the items on these different variables.
- no explicit comparison was made between the original eDom norms, collected in the USA, and these new norms. A brief report of such a comparison (e.g., correlation between the two sets of norms) could be useful in quantifying the importance of using dialect-specific norms for future studies, as highlighted in the last section.

**Reviewer B:** [Name not given]

**Review Completed:** 19 October 2015

The authors did a very fine job explaining how the data was generated. The data is also very clearly organised and can be easily used by other researchers.

It is clear also for a non-linguistic researchers what the re-use value is and what a great effort the authors did making this dataset.

Minor points: The xlsx files can be opened by openoffice but it is preferable to save the separate tabs of the file as csv or txt files as well for even easier access and machine readability.

It is currently stored at OSF, which is not one of the repositories endorsed by JOPD.