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

Paula Cristina[1]

1 Universidade Aberta Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for letting me read your article, "Digital Literacy Skills of Teachers: A Study on ICT Use and Purposes." The study you present in the paper is very interesting and reflects on an important issue at an international level.

Next, I present a series of recommendations that I would appreciate if you attend to them.

The title -Rewriting the study's title to more accurately represent its primary objective will be gratifying;

The abstract is relatively clear, but it could be made more concise.

The literature review felt a little too dense and generalized.

What is ITU, pay attention to the writing specification, do not know what the full name of ITU is? The full name should be indicated when it is first mentioned, and it is recommended to find the writing specification and make modifications.

The methods section could use more detail.

It mentions that SPSS was used for data analysis but doesn't specify what kind of analysis was conducted. SPSS is just a tool but not an approach for data analysis. Furthermore, authors should add the section for research approach. It is important to show if you approached the study qualitatively or quantitively.

It mentions that the study is helpful, but it doesn't explicitly state why it's valuable or how it contributes to the existing literature.

The introduction cites a few sources to support its claims but could benefit from more diverse and recent references. Additionally, there are several references listed, but the manuscript doesn't integrate them effectively into the text. Citations should be used to provide evidence for specific claims or to support arguments.

The methodology does not explain how the sample size of 281 teachers was determined. Without this information, it's difficult to assess whether the sample size is sufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.

References cited in the discussion were not culled from related empirical investigations;

The discussion might be more clearly organized to parallel the research questions to more directly address the study focus.

I hope these suggestions are clear and can help you enrich your work!

PB