Report on "Bridging the digital divide: measuring digital literacy" by Krish Chetty, Liu Qigui, Nozibele Gcora, Jaya Josie, Li Wenwei, and Chen Fang for *Economics*.

In the following, I outline my feedback on the paper. I want to make clear that I am not an expert in the field of policy making, so I evaluate the paper solely on the goals it set for itself and on its methodology.

The paper aims to develop a "digital literacy index". This goal appears worthwhile to follow. In outlining that goal, however, the paper could be much clearer. Several points are confusing.

My major concern with the paper is that it does not develop such an index. It develops a five-dimensional framework, which could be used as a basis for an index, but the paper does not achieve the goals that the authors have set for themselves. An index would be much more specific and applicable.

The second major concern is that the paper methodologically builds on a "systematic review of trends" but, unfortunately, the paper is not transparent how this was conducted. The selection of studies or any other methodological decisions are not documented. It is also unclear how the authors come up with the five-dimensional framework (Section 4.3). (Also why is it labeled multidisciplinary? The paper claims "it is clear that digital literacy is a multi-disciplinary concept". This claim is unsupported.)

The paper also aims to define the components of digital literacy. Although I am not an expert in this field, I have doubts that there is no prior literature providing such a definition. The authors should make sure that they build their definition to the largest possible extent on the extant literature in order to assure consistency. In this context, as well as in general, it is unusual that the authors present one definition of digital literacy as a finding of this study.

Note that sometimes it is argued that the approach to define digital literacy should be agile and at other occasions it is demanded that the definition itself should be agile (e.g., in Section 2). This is confusing and requires clarification. The authors should outline what they mean by agile. Demanding an agile definition is critical per se. An agile definition would fail to provide common grounds/understanding, which is the very purpose of a definition. Though I agree that the understanding of digital literacy is influenced by the dynamics of technological development, I don't think that an agile definition is a useful approach. In any case, the authors should outline their definition/understanding of agility.

Why is section 4.3 labeled "Benefits of measuring digital literacy"? Section 4 is the findings section, but the headline of Section 4.3 restates the motivation of the paper. This is confusing.

The paper could benefit from a professional editing service.