

# Review of: "Digital Literacy Skills of Teachers: A Study on ICT Use and Purposes"

Adrián Sánchez Vidal<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Veracruzana

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate you on the importance of your work. Next, I present a series of recommendations that I would appreciate if you attend to them.

- Add more references from 2023, since they only have one.
- Section 2 is very extensive, it would be convenient to reduce it, mainly in points 2.3.3. and 2.3.4. In the latter, the information on regions other than Africa is very extensive, I recommend reducing them.
- In point 2.4 there is: "Imparting digital competencies in the citizens is one recognized way to affect national growth in Zambia." Perhaps the verb "affect" is not the most appropriate because it can be understood as something negative.
- In the population and sample section, the sample size needs to be specified, it is only mentioned in the "abstract" and in point 3.3.
- The number of schools in the Study population mentioned in points 3.2 (20) and 3.3 (10) does not coincide.
- In section C of the methodology, the term DL is used without having defined it. I recommend putting it before, even though it is a known term.
- The reliability of the instrument is not presented.
- In tables 11, 13 and 14 it is mentioned that the results of the standard deviation indicate that the data is spread out, but it is already known that this is the standard deviation. It is recommended that you explain how spread out the data are with that range of values; that is, what that degree of dispersion means in each case.
- In the paragraph of table 13 it is recommended to change the text to: "This table shows the mean..."
- In the paragraph of table 17 it is mentioned that the standard deviation for all the tools is less than 1, but this is not true in half of the cases (5 out of 10). The same happens in the description of the results in Table 19, where it is not fulfilled in most cases (12 of 14).
- The results section has many tables and in some cases their description is not relevant.
- It is convenient to write the discussion relating the findings with the objectives of the study, in order to verify that these have been met.
- The conclusion is incomplete, especially in the wording of its last sentence, what is required?