

Peer Review

Review of: "Channeling the Flow — A Metaphor for Computer Programs"

Krešimir Rakić¹

1. University of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina

The paper brings an interesting and relevant topic that has the potential for further discussion and deepening. The author demonstrates good knowledge of the subject of research and manages to highlight key aspects of the problem. The structure of the paper is clear and logically organized, which makes it easier to follow the content. However, the paper as a whole leaves the impression of superficiality because it deals with a wide range of topics without deeper analysis and critical review. A more detailed elaboration of individual concepts is missing, as well as a more systematic connection of theoretical frameworks with practical examples.

Positive aspects of the paper:

- The topic of the paper is current and relevant and has the potential for further research.
- The structure and organization of the paper are clear, which makes it easy to follow the presented arguments.
- The author successfully identifies key issues and challenges related to the topic.
- The literature used is relevant and provides a good basis for discussion.

Areas for improvement:

- *Deep analysis:* The paper often remains at a descriptive level and does not delve sufficiently into the analysis of the problem. A more detailed consideration of key concepts and their elaboration through examples and critical review is recommended.
- *Critical approach:* The paper could contain more analytical insights and critical reviews of existing literature and practices, instead of just a descriptive review.
- *Connection between theory and practice:* There is a lack of concrete examples or case studies that would confirm the theoretical claims.

- *Conclusion:* The conclusion should be more strongly argued and connect the main findings of the paper with possible implications for future research or practical application.

Final recommendation:

The paper covers an interesting topic but leaves the impression of superficiality because it does not go into a deeper analysis and does not offer clear conclusions based on argumentative evidence. Additional elaboration of key parts, a stronger connection between theory and practice, and a critical review of the literature are recommended. With these improvements, the paper could significantly increase in quality and scientific value.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.