

Identifying the Digital Literacy Needs of Adolescents with Intellectual Disabilities: A Focus Group Study

Farhad. Namjoo^{1*}, Atefeh. Namjoo¹

¹ Department of Educational Psychology, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan

* Corresponding author email address: Yutou_wei@gmail.com

Editor

Seyyed Mohsen Asgharinekah^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of
Counseling and Educational
Psychology, Faculty of Education
and Psychology, Ferdowsi
University of Mashhad, Mashhad,
Iran
asghari-n@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Thseen Nazir^{id}

Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University,
Istanbul, Turkey.

Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr

Reviewer 2: Sara Nejatifar^{id}

Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of
Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In paragraph 1, while the introduction discusses digital exclusion and self-efficacy, it lacks a clear theoretical framework. The inclusion of a guiding theory such as Social Cognitive Theory or Universal Design for Learning could enhance conceptual depth.

The sentence "...remains underexplored" (end of introduction, paragraph 6) should be substantiated with citation trends or a literature map showing scarcity in Asia-Pacific contexts. Currently, the claim is asserted without evidence.

The description of the "semi-structured interview guide" (Methods, Measures) is too vague. A few sample questions or thematic areas (e.g., safety, autonomy, learning apps) would enhance reproducibility.

There is overlap between subthemes 3.4 ("Parental and Teacher Attitudes") and 4.1 ("Role of Caregivers and Family"). Consider merging or differentiating these more clearly to avoid thematic redundancy.

Table 1 is informative but densely packed. Consider splitting it into four separate tables, each representing one overarching theme for better readability and referencing in the discussion.

The statement “...mirror many of the patterns observed globally...” (Discussion, paragraph 6) needs elaboration. Which patterns are culturally invariant and which are culturally contingent? Add contrasting examples from Western literature.

While paragraph 7 in the Discussion calls for “policies that address infrastructural disparities,” it would benefit from specifying actionable policy types—e.g., digital subsidies, assistive technology grants, inclusive curriculum mandates.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The phrase “Digital literacy is not only critical for accessing information and services, but also for fostering autonomy, social inclusion, and self-efficacy...” (Introduction, paragraph 1) cites three sources {Assainova & Anuar, 2025; Mills, 2025; Park, 2025} that are later cited repeatedly. Streamline by citing more diverse sources or grouping citations more economically.

While the Ethics section notes adherence to the Helsinki Declaration, it would strengthen transparency to include the institutional review board (IRB) approval number or issuing body (e.g., university ethics committee).

The authors mention that participants “demonstrate curiosity and partial engagement” (Discussion, paragraph 1). Please clarify that these findings reflect the sampled group, not all adolescents with ID.

In discussing the role of families and teachers (Discussion, paragraph 4), the manuscript could benefit from citing specific intervention models (e.g., Parent-mediated tech education, Digital Buddy Programs) to enrich discussion of supports.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.