



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Assessing the Quality and Responsiveness of Reference Service in a Science-Oriented School Library
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The topic about assessing library reference services is very practical, especially because libraries really need to adapt to digital changes today. As a reviewer, I appreciate the effort you put into gathering this data and highlighting the importance of both traditional and digital services.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Abstract The abstract should mention the exact number of participants so readers know the scale of the study immediately.
Introduction 1. Your research gap is very weak. You stated that the gap is just because this specific science-oriented school in Quezon City has not been studied yet. Simply changing the location is not a strong academic gap. You need to explain what is unique about a science-oriented high school



library compared to a normal high school library. Do these students need different types of data?

2. You connected your local library study to the UN SDGs 4, 9, and 10. I strongly advise removing this. Claiming that a 28-person survey in one school supports global industry, innovation, and reduced inequalities is a massive overstatement. Keep your claims grounded to your actual local context.

Methodology

Your sample size of 28 participants is a major concern. You mentioned 3.6% of your respondents are faculty. If we do the math, 3.6% of 28 is exactly 1 person. It is statistically invalid to make conclusions about faculty satisfaction when you only interviewed one single teacher. You must state this clearly as a limitation or change your design to a qualitative case study instead of a descriptive statistical study.

Results and Discussion

1. I urge you to re-check all your raw data. You stated that 94.5% of respondents reported active participation. But 94.5% of 28 people is 26.46 people. You cannot have half of a person. Similarly, you mentioned 38.9% use email services and 58% cite inadequate facilities. None of these percentages result in whole numbers when multiplied by 28. This makes me question if the data was calculated correctly, or if some participants skipped questions. If they skipped questions, you must specify the n value for each specific question.

2. There is a big contradiction in your findings. You wrote that 100% of users agreed or strongly agreed they are satisfied with the outcome. But in the very next paragraph, you said 58% complained about inadequate facilities and 36.9% about budget limits. How can satisfaction be perfectly 100% if the majority complain about the physical facilities? You need to separate satisfaction with the librarian staff from satisfaction with the library itself, and discuss this nuance.

3. You mentioned that librarians identified material misplacement and unstable Wi-Fi as challenges. Since this is a science-oriented school, does the unstable Wi-Fi heavily block their access to digital science journals? You should discuss how these specific challenges affect science students specifically.

Conclusion

The conclusion is too generic. Sentences like stating the library must invest in technological upgrades and human resource development can apply to any library in the world. Please write a conclusion that is directly pulled from your specific 28 respondents and your specific school context. What exact technology do they need based on your survey?

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses an important topic because reference services remain necessary in supporting students, faculty, and staff in accessing reliable information. The study has practical value, especially for improving library services in a science-oriented school.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The research gap needs to be clearer. The introduction states that there is a gap in studying reference services in a science-oriented school library, but it does not explain well what is already known, what is still missing, and why this specific setting adds new knowledge.
The methodology lacks important details about the participants and sampling. The study has only 28 respondents, with very few faculty participants, but the paper does not explain how they were selected or whether this number is enough to represent the users of the library.
The survey instrument needs stronger explanation. The paper mentions Likert-scale questions, interviews, and observations, but it does not describe the actual indicators, validation process, reliability, or how the questions measured quality and responsiveness.
The results should be presented more systematically. Percentages are reported in the text, but there are no clear tables showing the main findings. This makes it harder to see the pattern of responses and to judge whether the conclusions are fully supported.
The qualitative findings from interviews and observations are not sufficiently developed. The paper mentions librarian interviews, but the analysis is mostly descriptive. It would be useful to show clear themes and explain how these themes were derived from the data.
Some conclusions and recommendations are too broad compared with the evidence presented. For example, the suggestion to adopt artificial intelligence needs more justification, since the study does not clearly assess readiness, resources, staff capacity, or user demand for AI-based services.
The discussion needs deeper connection with recent literature. Several sources are cited, but the paper can still improve by comparing its findings more critically with previous studies and by using more recent and directly related references on digital reference services and library service quality.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			