

Review of: "Digital Identity and Promotion of Research Works - Case Study of Social Science Researchers at Taiwanese Institutions"

Javier Tarango¹

¹ Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Publisher:

I believe that the article Digital Identity and Promotion of Research Works - Case Study of Social Science Researchers at Taiwanese Institutions represents an interesting proposal in the field of evaluation of scientific researchers and its relationship with behavior patterns in the use of electronic tools as a means of popularization of science. However, I believe that the text of the document should be readjusted considering the following observations:

- to). Redo the abstract as it is inconclusive and neither the identified findings nor the conclusions are mentioned. It is necessary to consult the APA 7th edition manual in what corresponds to the abstract structure of methodological articles, there it is mentioned that a good abstract must have four fundamental elements in a specific order.
- b). In the part of the title it says that it is a case study and in the body of the document it considers that it is a descriptive analysis. Not really a case study, that expression in the title should be removed.
- c). It analyzes several technological options used for specific purposes by researchers such as Google Scholar, ORCID, etc., what I did not understand is why Twitter is included in those categories.
- d). The sample used must be correctly defined, it only indicates that there are 127 participants, but not the way in which they were reached.
- and). The classification of the sections of the article is incorrect, for example, II, III and IV in turn are divided into II.I, III.I and IV.I, where II.2, III.2 and IV remained. 2. A section cannot be divided into only one subsection, it is necessary to make the decision to remove that subsection or add at least one other subsection.
- f). Please add a title to each table, it is necessary and essential.
- g). It is recommended to divide the article into the following specific sections: introduction, theoretical framework, methodology, analysis of results and conclusions. The way they present it now is confusing and then it is considered that some content may or may not belong to the header in which they were grouped.

This article is considered to be ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION WITH EXTENSIVE MODIFICATIONS.

I remain attentive to any questions or comments.

Javier Tarango – Autonomous University of Chihuahua (Mexico).