

Review of: "Digitalization of research: do ICT improve scientific production in developing countries?"

Santos Lopez-Leyva

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of the paper: *Digitalization of research: do ICT improve scientific production in developing countries?*

This article addresses an interesting topic because it aims to explain the influence of the digitalization of research on the improvement of scientific production among researchers in developing countries.

To make the article more interesting and present a better analysis and explanation of the problem in question, the following recommendations would be advisable.

To formulate a working hypothesis in which the possible relationship between variables involved in the study is shown. It is necessary to offer an explanation of the variables and support them with descriptive statistics.

The dependent variable is the productivity of researchers, which involves the number of scientific articles produced and the number of patents registered. It is not clear how to understand this variable, which is a product of the number of articles and the number of patents; they are two sources that follow different dynamics in terms of their origin and development. It is necessary to clarify how to group these two sources to achieve an adequate measurement. It is necessary to specify whether it refers to productivity per researcher or to the country's production.

There is a lack of explanations regarding the independent variables, where the main one is diffusion, which considers the Internet, but there are no proper justifications for how the Internet influences scientific production. It does not include variables that explain the improvement of the internet in the countries. There are no explanations for the inclusion of governance, corruption, and democracy in researchers' productivity.

The authors must strengthen the theoretical framework in such a way that a relationship is observed between the variables discussed in the theoretical framework, the model used, and the discussion of results. The institutional dimension is addressed, but theoretical proposals in this regard are scarce. Review new literature that is used to explain the institutions related to the production and dissemination of knowledge.

Improve the presentation of the work since there are repeated paragraphs.

It is necessary to strengthen the conclusions since these refer to how the work was done and not to its contributions. It is

necessary to specify how knowledge in this field is strengthened. It is not necessary to carry out an investigation to establish: *As a result, we recommend that the governments of these countries continue to take steps to improve governance. In particular, they should continue with the democratization of these countries.* This is common sense.

I extend the invitation to researchers to continue working on this topic since it is interesting for the scientific community that works on the knowledge society.