



Review B of *From electronic voting to AI: lessons from the Estonian Case on the transformation of digital democracy*

<https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-5245.31.145465B>

Reviewed article: BATTISTA, Daniele. From electronic voting to AI: lessons from the Estonian Case on the transformation of digital democracy. **Em Questão**, Porto Alegre, v. 31, e-145465, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-5245.31.145465>

REVIEW

Completed on: 2025-04-19 12:53 PM

Recommendation: Resubmit for review

1. Adequacy to the editorial profile of Em Questão: *

Good

2. Relevance of the topic: *

Good

3. Originality in approaching the topic: *

Bad

4. Contribution to Information Science: *

Good

5. Remarks regarding relevance, originality and contribution to the area of knowledge:

This is an interesting and relevant topic. The paper seems to be an overview of some literature about digital democracy and AI with discussion related to the case of Estonia.

6. Quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework: *

Bad

7. Remarks regarding quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework:

Although the paper refers to frameworks, paradigms and landscapes, there is no mention of a specific theoretical model. It would be useful to focus on one model/framework/theory and explain why it was chosen and its relevance to this case study.

8. Relevance and adequacy of methodological procedures: *

Bad

9. Clarity in presenting and detailing methodological procedures: *

Bad

10. Remarks regarding methodological procedures:

There was no description of the methodology for this paper. It is not clear whether this is a discussion paper, a literature review or report of a study that involved data gathering.

11. Rationality and discussion of results and coherence of conclusions: *

Bad

12. Remarks regarding the results and conclusions.

The second half of this paper was much better and more coherent. The first part (sections 1-3) was difficult to follow and contained a lot of irrelevant material or things that were tangential to the main focus of the paper.

13. Quality of argumentation (clarity, conciseness, objectivity), textual correction and text structure:*

Bad

14. Remarks regarding the language and writing of the text:

The first half of this paper contained a lot of statements that were not substantiated with evidence from the literature or the data gathering for this study. The text needs to be organised and condensed so that it is focused on the theme of the paper. Presenting ideas in paragraphs would help to show how the arguments were developed. Shorter sentences would also provide greater clarity about the specific points being made. Some of the sentences did not convey any particular meaning and could be left out all together. The balance of the paper is lopsided with long, rambling introductory sections (sections 1-3). Section 4 was more coherent and was better written.

15. What is your recommendation on accepting the article?*

Accept it with corrections (specify below).

16. Specify the suggested changes and/or justify the non-acceptance.*

Sections 1-3 need to be condensed and focused on setting the scene for the study of digital democracy and AI in Estonia. A lot of the material in these sections was tangential to the paper and could be left out.

Recommendation: RESUBMIT FOR REVIEW

