

Reviewer #1

1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions of the submission, how it fits within the scope of the journal, and your recommendation:

This is an impressive and potentially useful project. The paper is mostly well written but there are a few notable instances where further clarity is needed (see section 2). The primary issue with the paper is that it does not spend enough time on the tool itself. It provides a general overview, and discusses other projects, but 2 or 3 use cases would be very helpful to concretize what it can do. I understand it's general, but what is an example project that might use this? When would you use it? Have you used it? Which sort of data visualizations does it do? Which sort of custom reports? Two or three specific use cases would be helpful here. Hearing about some exemplars would greatly strengthen the paper. My general impression is that the core idea is solid but needs some reworking to be suitable for publication.

2) Content:

Please consider the originality, relevance and rigour of the submission and the author's depth of understanding of the issues being researched. Please comment on the adequacy of the author's referencing and whether or not the existing knowledge base has been explored and built upon.

Please examine the methodologies used and their appropriateness, and the author's use of the evidential base. Is all statistical analysis sound? Does the conclusion reflect the argument in the main body text, is it supported by factual data, and does it bring something new to the debate? Overall, is the submission scientifically sound?:

There isn't exactly an argument here, which is fine, since it is describing a project.

I did find the article to be a little light on references, even for a short paper. The section on ludomusicology, for instance, could be beefed up (and should probably at least point to Karen Collins' Game Sound, since it shares a name with the project and is essential). This will help orient readers who aren't familiar with this corner of game studies.

There are also some issues with jargon and clarity. I'd like a little more specificity on what's meant by "quantitative game analysis," as that can take myriad forms. A short, general definition would be helpful, followed by examples of how quantitative data is used in this project.

Furthermore, in the discussion of the diagram (IEZA), the authors note numbers like "first dimension" in the text but not on the diagram itself. I suggest specifying in-text, e.g. "diegetic dimension," for clarity. Furthermore, the terms, "zone, interface," etc., should be defined or clarified with examples. At present they are unclear descriptors.

3) Structure and argument:

Please consider whether the abstract summarises the arguments in a succinct and accurate way. Is the manuscript logically structured and do the arguments flow coherently? Is there enough reference to methodology in the introduction and are the arguments fully evidenced and substantiated? Does the introduction signpost the arguments and does the conclusion adequately summarise them?:

The structure was fine for the most part, but the "Case Studies" section seems out of place. It would be more helpful to list examples of quantitative work at the outset of the paper, and then discuss how GameSound contributes to these methodologies.

4) Figures/tables:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures or maps – their relevance in terms of illustrating the arguments and supporting the evidential base, the quality of the formatting and presentation.:

As noted above, I found the lone figure to be confusing and not helpful to the paper in its current form. Further elaboration will help.

5) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and need for grammatical improvement.:

Other than examples noted above, it is lucid and well written.

Reviewer #2:

1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions of the submission, how it fits within the scope of the journal, and your recommendation:

As someone who is interested in sound, games, and conjectural criticism, I find this project to be quite interesting. Given the length (brevity) of the piece, I assume the research is being contextualized by the journal as a project-in-progress (or, if you will, work in its middle state). With that assumption in mind, I'll focus my feedback on the possibility for minor revisions.

I wonder whether the authors are willing to:

- Engage sound from the start. The introduction focuses more generally on approaching games through their component parts. Why, then, focus on sound? Why is it an interesting part among others? (To be clear, I think audio is a very interesting component

part of games, but I'd love to hear more from the authors.)

- Address sound studies just a smidgen, if only something canonical (e.g., Sterne) or directly related to digital sound (e.g., Digital Sound Studies, edited by Mary Caton Lingold, Darren Mueller, and Whitney Trettien for Duke UP). If these references are there, and I missed them, then apologies for the oversight.
- Also address what it means to *listen* or *hear* via quantitative analysis. Or is the audio being treated only as text? Either way, Tanya Clement's work comes immediately to mind. The problem of "distant listening" remains one that few scholars have engaged in depth, and she's one of those few scholars.
- Consider Denson's work on digital seriality, which may be a model for GameSound and its computational / quantitative approach to games as component parts:
<http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/22.1/topoi/denson/index.html>.
- Elaborate a touch on the sort of findings, or the sort of inquiry, that may be possible via GameSound. Perhaps another paragraph or two in the conclusion? I follow the goal "to allow new collaborators to sift through the video game of their choice with ease, allowing them to access the audio elements of a game," but to what ends or effects? What types of interpretation and what kind of results might follow from this sifting? What might game studies, or media studies, or sound studies learn from it all?