

Peer Review: A scoping review of internet access, digital literacy, and health outcomes in adults with Type 2 diabetes

Matthew S. Farmer PhD, RN¹

Collaborators: 2 reviewers

¹ Sinclair School of Nursing, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, USA
MF: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0989-2968>

Accepted by 2 of 2 reviewers

Funding Information

This study received no funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares they have no competing interests.

Publishing History

Submitted 31 May 2024
Accepted 24 March 2025
Published 28 April 2025

Corresponding Author

Matthew Steven Farmer
msfppy@missouri.edu



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons

Transparent Peer Review

- [View reviewer summaries](#)
- [View 2nd resubmission](#)
- [View 1st resubmission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)
- [View initial submission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)

Recommended Citation

Farmer, M. S. (2025). A scoping review of internet access, digital literacy, and health outcomes in adults with Type 2 diabetes. *Stacks Journal*: 25004.
<https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-25004>



Reviewer Summaries

Nicole Johnson

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

no

What did the authors do a good job with?

Overall, the paper is well organized and strongly written, particularly the intro and rationale. It is clear the topic is of substantive importance.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

The authors do a fine job identifying possible avenues for future research in the final thoughts of the discussion, but I think they could do more to draw out the implications of their findings. Is it possible to characterize the scope of qualitative inquiries included in the review and then suggest a few further exploratory angles that are necessary for better understanding the phenomenon of some people just not being interested in using technological resources at their disposal? It might also be reasonable to consider the factors studied in quant projects and opportunities for advancing those efforts.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

I think the design and methods were well thought out and clearly described.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

I find myself wanting more detail in the description of the studies. You mention a list of topics that are present, but it would be good to know the angles of the RQs, any other data collection than interviews? Types of statistical tests? Quant data collection methods? All of these details could set the stage for a more robust discussion of future directions for research in this area.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

typo on line 76 - "was" should be "were"

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

no

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Revise and resubmit

1st Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

While the Results section was reorganized, the section remains rather limited and lacking depth.



Based on your review, what should happen next?

This article should be sent back to the authors for *more revisions*

Why is this article not ready to be published?

The authors added new concerns in their edits that need to be addressed

What do the authors need to change for you to accept this article for publication?

Include more detail and depth to the results section, revise the table matrix for readability, fix typos/errors

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator

2nd Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

no

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

5/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

none

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper is ready for publication

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator

David Kerr

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

This is an important topic. Although the data presented are somewhat limited, the approach was sound

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

I am not sure that this will add a great deal given the paucity of results

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

We need to see more detail in the results section

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

See previous answer

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

Expand the results section

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Revise and resubmit



1st Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

A few additional comments have been added

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This article should be sent back to the authors for *more revisions*

Why is this article not ready to be published?

The authors added new concerns in their edits that need to be addressed

What do the authors need to change for you to accept this article for publication?

The Supplementary Table has poor readability

2nd Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

No more feedback needed

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper is ready for publication

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator