Review of: "The Key to Academic Equity: A Detailed Review of EdChat's Strategies"

Fernando Bolaños[1]

1 Universidad de Chile

Review OPIR35

Dear author,

I hope this text finds you well. Thank you for writing this review. I found it interesting. However, there are several areas that could be improved. In what follows I will offer some suggestions and, when prudent, I will offer references.

Concerns regarding methodology

Although you detail your research methodology, there is little to no way for the reader to evaluate the rigor of your approach. Accordingly, we cannot take a stance on the validity of your claims. For example, your literature review: there are research approaches to conducting literature reviews that would allow the reader to evaluate your findings (see, for example, Boote and Beile (2005) or Grant and Booth (2009)). However, in your case, we cannot trace your steps and, based on these, reach our own conclusions.

Oversimplification and normativity

There are sentences where you oversimplify the phenomenon at hand and even seem to take a normative stance. For example, you state that: "In an era where information is abundant but attention spans are reducing, there is a growing demand for more digestible and accessible forms of academic content". Here I would ask: When was information not abundant (and for whom)? Is it not that the amount of information is not what is chief, but rather what is of importance are the forms through which we can access information? Succinctly, I would agree with others who claim that it is not a question of quantity, but rather that the decisive cog in today's information landscapes is the access (via digital technologies) to information (Anderson, 2008; Egan & Shera, 1952; Haider & Sundin, 2022; Lloyd, 2010; Shera, 1970; van Dijk & van Deursen, 2014). Furthermore, you seem to say that because "attention spans are reducing" we need to find ways to make "academic content more digestible"; but, would it not be better to find ways to *increase* attention spans? Are shorter attention spans what we, as society, want? I don't have an answer to these questions, but they are by no means simple. Accordingly, one needs to debate the more profound implications of what they would entail. There are many other examples where you oversimplify and take a normative stance (see, for example, Haider's and Sundin's (2022) paradoxes of media and information literacy).

Other suggestions

If you are going to use figures form other authors, you still need to make sure that the reader can understand them without having to consult the source. For example, what is meant by Gold OA and Green OA?

References

Anderson, R. E. (2008). Implications of the Information and Knowledge Society for Education. In *International Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education* (pp. 5–22). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73315-9_1

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation. *Educational Researcher*, *34*(6), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034006003

Egan, M., & Shera, J. (1952). Foundations of a Theory of Bibliography. *The Library Quarterly*, *22*(2), 125–137.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, *26*(2), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x

Haider, J., & Sundin, O. (2022). *Paradoxes of Media and Information Literacy. The Crisis of Information.*. Routledge.

Lloyd, A. (2010). *Information Literacy Landscapes: Information Literacy in Education, Workplace and Everyday Contexts*. Chandos Publishing.

Shera, J. (1970). *Sociological Foundations of Librarianship*. Asia Publishing House.

van Dijk, J. A. G. M., & van Deursen, A. J. A. M. (2014). *Digital Skills*. Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137437037