



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	The Impact of Library Resources and Services Utilization on the Academic Performance among Students of the Institute of Formation and Religious Studies
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 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 manuscript addresses a relevant topic, especially in showing how library resources and services may support students in a theological and religious studies setting. The study has value because it focuses on a specific learning context that is not often discussed. However, the paper still needs stronger methodological clarity and more careful interpretation of the results, especially because the design mainly shows relationship, not direct impact.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The title and several parts of the paper use the word “impact,” but the method is mainly descriptive and correlational. Since the study only reports association between library utilization and academic performance, the authors should avoid making causal claims unless there is stronger evidence. This matters because the current wording may overstate what the data can actually prove.



The measurement of academic performance needs to be clarified. The framework mentions GWA, research output, comprehensive exam, thesis proposal, and final defense grades, but the results seem to focus mainly on GWA. The authors should clearly explain which academic performance indicators were actually used in the correlation analysis and how these were obtained.

The inclusion of audit students needs further explanation. Since audit students may not receive grades or academic credits in the same way as regular students, it is unclear how their academic performance was measured. This may affect the validity of the correlation result and should be addressed clearly.

The mixed-method design is stated, but the integration of quantitative and qualitative findings is still weak. The qualitative quotations mostly support the survey findings, but there is limited deeper analysis of how the interview data explain or challenge the numbers. The authors should strengthen the integration so that the mixed-method approach becomes more meaningful.

The research instrument needs stronger reporting. The paper mentions expert validation and pilot testing with three alumni, but it does not report reliability results or enough detail on how the questionnaire was developed. This is important because the main findings depend heavily on the quality of the survey tool.

The discussion is too long and sometimes repetitive. Several sections repeat the findings rather than critically explaining their meaning. The authors should shorten the discussion and focus more on the most important findings, such as the significant relationship, low use of referral services, occasional OPAC use, and technology-related challenges.

The ethical approval section should be more specific. The manuscript states that the study was approved by a Research Ethics Committee, but the approval number, approval date, or protocol reference should be included. This is important because the study involved students and used academic performance data.

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>
I appreciate the effort you put into this research. Using a convergent parallel mixed-method approach is a very smart choice for this kind of study because it allows you to capture both the statistical trends and the real feelings of the students. Exploring the combined use of resources and services in a theological library is a good contribution to the field. Overall, the paper has a solid foundation and the findings are interesting. However, I see several areas that need improvement before it is fully polished. My main concerns are about how the academic performance variable is presented, some missing details in the methodology, and a few



technical formatting errors in the results section. The writing is mostly clear, but adjusting the logical flow of your data presentation will make your arguments much stronger.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Conceptual Framework and Variables

1. In your Input-Process-Output model, you listed multiple outputs for academic performance, including student GWA, research output, comprehensive exam, and thesis proposal grades. But when I look at your statistical results, you only show a single correlation score of 0.575 for academic performance. I am a bit confused here. Did you combine all these different grades into one single score, or did you only use the GWA? Please explain this clearly in the text.

2. You mentioned that you coordinated with the Academic Dean and Registrar to get the students' GWA. It would be very helpful to add a descriptive table showing the average GWA of the respondents before you show the correlation test. Without this, the readers do not know the actual academic standing of these 57 students.

Methodology

1. You stated that you used Likert-scale questions to quantify library utilization. However, you forgot to mention the specific range of the scale. Is it a 4-point or 5-point scale? Since you have mean scores like 3.53 and 2.46, it is important to explicitly state the scale so readers can understand how you got the interpretations of often or sometimes.

2. Please double-check your timeline and dates. You wrote that your respondents are enrolled for the 2025-2026 academic year, and you also mentioned a new Wi-Fi installation that happened in September 2025. If you are writing this paper before those dates, this might be a typo. Please correct the years so the study timeline is logical and realistic.

3. Using a census method for the 57 students is appropriate since it is the entire target population. Just be careful when making very broad generalizations with a smaller sample size.

Results Section

1. Watch out for your table numbering. You labeled the summary of library services as Table 5. Later on, the table showing challenges affecting library utilization is also labeled as Table 5. Please change the second one to Table 6, and remember to adjust the numbering for the Spearman rho table and any text referring to them.

2. Some of the interview transcripts from the students look very long and perfectly structured, for example, the combined response from Student A and C about the printing services. Please make sure you are presenting the authentic voices of the participants. If you translated their answers or heavily edited them for grammar, you need to state that in your data analysis section.

3. I really like how you handled the referral service data. You found it has the lowest utilization with a mean of 1.07. Then you used the qualitative data to explain that students just do not need it because they are already very satisfied with the current IFRS library collection. This is an excellent example of mixing quantitative and qualitative findings.

Discussion and Conclusion

1. Your discussion section is written well. You successfully compared your findings with several previous researchers, like the study of Gados and Lascano regarding reference services. This gives good academic weight to your paper.



2. In your conclusion, your recommendations match your findings nicely. For example, your suggestion to integrate OPAC use as a resource discovery tool makes perfect sense because your data showed it is only sometimes used by the students.

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 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</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.			