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Reviewer's report:

I think that the methodology of the paper seems sound, and the idea of having a more portable assessment of voice is potentially very interesting. The problem I have is with the premise.

The handheld "objective" measure is no more portable than GRBAS and MPT which is what it is being tested against.

If the point is to let people without training in vocal analysis, make some measurements of vocal function, then I suppose that has been achieved. Unfortunately, all this shows is that the app is about as effective as performing GRBAS and MPT. If you are affecting the voice, then surely you should be able to do these two simple and effective assessments, therefore negating the need for the app.

A more useful study would be to compare the OperaVox with the more standard lab acoustic analysis packages. If there was good correlation for validated objective measures (jitter and shimmer etc) between the two systems, then that would be of benefit. I didn't see anywhere that this had been done (although the developers may have done this).
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