Review of: "A Review of Transformation and Digital Literacy for the Sustainable Development in the Greater Mekong Subregion – Working Paper"

Sanaz Nikghadam-Hojjati[1]

1 Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Lack of Methodological Clarity: The paper lacks transparency in detailing the specific methodology employed for the comprehensive review. Readers are left wondering about the criteria for literature selection, data analysis methods, and the overall rigour of the research process. Providing more clarity on the methodology would enhance the paper's credibility.

2. Overemphasis on Digital Intelligence: While the paper rightly highlights the significance of digital intelligence (DQ), it tends to overly focus on its components without sufficiently linking them to the practical implications for sustainable development. The discussion on DQ could benefit from more concrete examples or case studies demonstrating how improvements in digital intelligence directly contribute to the GMS's sustainable development.

3. Limited Empirical Evidence: The paper relies heavily on existing literature and lacks substantial empirical evidence to support its claims. Integrating real-world case studies or empirical data from the GMS would strengthen the paper's argumentation and make it more applicable to the specific context of the GMS.

4. Ambiguity in Transformation Strategies: While the paper introduces the concept of transformation, it falls short in providing concrete strategies for achieving the necessary shift towards sustainability. A more detailed exploration of specific industries, policy recommendations, or successful initiatives within the GMS would add practical value to the paper.

5. Insufficient Addressing of Limitations: The limitations section is brief and does not thoroughly acknowledge potential shortcomings in the research. Identifying and openly discussing limitations, such as regional variations or data gaps, would contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the study's constraints.

6. Lack of Counterarguments: A robust academic paper often addresses counterarguments to strengthen its position. The absence of counterarguments or alternative perspectives weakens the paper's overall academic rigour. Including opposing viewpoints would demonstrate a more comprehensive engagement with the subject.

7. Future Works Section Needs Specificity: The future works section is vague in suggesting areas for further research. Providing more specific and focused directions for future studies would enhance the paper's impact and guide researchers interested in expanding on the presented ideas.