

# Review of: "Innovation in Local Digital Media: The Case of Sevilla Directo"

Raúl Rojas-Andrés<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de La Coruña

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

## Topic and objectives:

The paper addresses a topical and relevant issue, which is the adaptation of local media to the digital environment, a crucial area given the transformation journalism is undergoing globally. Focusing on a hyperlocal medium like Sevilla Directo adds value to the study, highlighting how small media can innovate and adapt in a market dominated by major players. It includes a good introduction and well-defined, relevant objectives.

## Introduction and theoretical framework:

The introduction is very good. However, the theoretical framework is poor, which subsequently complicates the analysis of results.

## Methodology:

The methodology is mixed, appropriate, and well-chosen. The case study is justified. However, it does not explain how the case study was conducted or for how long. It does not detail how the focus group and interviews were conducted, what type of interviews they were, what script was used, how long they lasted, or who they were conducted with. It also does not specify what data sources were used, merely vaguely mentioning the analysis of "reports", "economic data", or "websites", without further specification. Particularly important, although a financial data analysis is mentioned, no information is provided on what data were analysed or how. Ultimately, a methodological design is not presented but rather a list of technique names to be applied without allowing the reader to understand how they were implemented to evaluate their application and, thus, assess the results or replicate the study.

## Results:

The results are more a description of the medium than an actual analysis of the medium, something hampered, as already mentioned, by a poor theoretical framework. Additionally, this description tends to be strangely laudatory: it makes value judgements, such as the medium's commitment to generating high-quality content, without providing empirical evidence to justify these claims, that is, without specifying what techniques used have yielded these results and why such results are considered indicative of high-quality content creation. This section suffers from a significant flaw: it is not possible to know from which technique each result stems. The results are often referred to literature, not to the techniques used, which casts doubt on their character as results.

#### Discussion and conclusions:

The discussion of the results is superficial. A deeper analysis of the obtained results is recommended to transcend the merely descriptive layer.

#### Final assessment:

In summary, the study harbours potential yet remains encumbered by certain methodological and theoretical limitations. The study suffers from an insufficient theoretical approach and poor methodological design. The former results in its findings being unfruitful, as once their descriptive layer is surpassed, they are not analysed from perspectives that could respond to the set objectives and research questions. The latter renders these results unassessable and their replication impossible.

It would be beneficial to enrich the theoretical framework with more robust conceptual models. This would not only enhance the analytical depth of the study but also provide a firmer ground for interpreting the data. An explanation of how the methodologies used were carried out would significantly improve the possibility of assessing the results and replicating the study. Encouraging a transparent exposition of data sources and analysis processes will undoubtedly augment the scholarly contribution of the work.