

Review of: "Digital Literacy in People with Disabilities: An Overview and Narrative Review"

María D. De-Juan-Vigaray¹

¹ Universidad de Alicante

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

In connection with the implications of the study, 'By promoting digital literacy in people with disabilities, we can bridge the digital divide and empower them to participate fully in today's increasingly digital society'" it may be somewhat generic and something we already knew before starting the study. While it is true that promoting these actions can close the digital gap, it would be interesting to provide a more precise and revealing conclusion based on the entire study.

Introduction

The introduction part should delve into the topic (which has been already introduced), capturing the reader's interest and then proceeding to explain the gaps the author has identified that have not yet been studied. It should create interest into what exactly the author aims to study, why, and for what purpose, providing a brief presentation on how the work will be presented.

Once this introduction is completed, the reader knows what is pretended to do. We cannot wait for several pages to understand precisely what the objective is.

Literature review

Afterwards, in the literature review section, the author should start introducing all the key concepts . For example **Digital Divide**; this way the reader receives all the information about this topic and afterwards a second heading should be presenting: **Digital Literacy** (and then a subheading of this part = Levels of Digital Literacy). A table is suggested to present the levels of DL (type, explanation, authors).

Typo MILEstones!

Objectives

The gap should have been previously identified (e.g. in the introduction). In this part author should present the objectives very clear:

1. To explore the differences in accessibility, employment opportunities, social inclusion, and education options between PWDs and unaffected populations.
2. To investigate the availability of evaluation instruments for measuring digital parameters in PWDs is also an area that requires further investigation.

Afterwards in the conclusions they will refer to the objectives that have been clearly identified. In fact in this part the author mention “the importance of conducting a literature review”, but that was previously done

Method

For this part I would suggest to identify the different parts. It is a very long paragraph full of information that should be clearer and better presented. Data, Analysis, etc..

Results

Again, long and tedious paragraphs to read. Results section requires better organization. Results should be organised in accordance to the objectives stated previously.

Once again, there is a noticeable imbalance in the presentation of information, with some paragraphs being excessively long and making it challenging to identify their subject matter. It is advisable to organize the information systematically to enhance clarity. For instance, authors may consider that a “reader” of this information could be a blind person. In this way, specialized software designed for reading information to the blind people would read the content. However, undoubtedly, the process of reading and comprehending the information would be challenging since there are no subheadings to help structure the content, and the paragraphs lack balance in presenting ideas cohesively and connecting them to the objectives. In such a case, the lengthy paragraphs with copious data and the absence of titles to aid in locating specific information may present difficulties for the reader and merit improved organization.

The title 'Measures of Digital Literacy' is not very clear regarding whether it belongs to the results section or is a separate section. Are the conclusions? The theoretical implications? The implications? This should be clarified through the use of font type and size. While it appears to be different part from the results, it needs better organization and alignment with the stated objectives.

The title involving 'DL' and 'PWDs' should avoid acronyms and use the full words.

Similarly, the following titles mix acronyms and full words (e.g., 'Ethical Issues of Digital Literacy in PWDs'). The same issue is observed in the presentation of information in these parts, with long paragraphs and excessive information that could be synthesized .

References

The references could include the doi number.

