

Review Form2

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1866
Title of the Manuscript:	Artificial Intelligence in Libraries: Advancements and User-Focused Innovations
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study on the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on libraries addresses an important and timely topic with significant implications for the future of library services. While the study successfully highlights key areas where AI is making strides, such as automated cataloging and enhanced search capabilities, there are several areas where coherency and flow could be improved to better support reader understanding and engagement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Transforming Libraries with AI: Enhancements and User-Centric Innovations	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	- Highlight Ethical Considerations: Mention the importance of addressing ethical considerations such as data privacy and bias in AI implementation. - Emphasize User Experience: Include a brief mention of how AI enhances user experience through personalized recommendations and intelligent resource management. - Community Engagement: Add a point about how AI helps libraries engage with their communities more effectively. - Future Directions: Briefly touch upon the potential future directions and innovations in AI for libraries.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	One major issue with the study is its overall structure. The content is somewhat fragmented, making it difficult to follow a logical progression of ideas. A more effective structure might include: 1. An introduction to AI technologies relevant to libraries. 2. A detailed exploration of their impact on specific library services. 3. A discussion of the historical context. 4. The challenges and ethical considerations. 5. Future directions. This reordered structure would allow readers to first grasp the technological advancements before delving into their implications and context. For example, the transition from historical context to the understanding of AI in libraries feels abrupt. The study could benefit from a connecting paragraph that bridges these sections, explaining how historical developments have set the stage for current AI advancements. Clarity of Concepts: While the study explains the concepts of machine learning and natural language processing well, there	

Review Form2

	is a noticeable lack of concrete examples. For instance, when discussing automated cataloging, the study could mention specific software or systems libraries are currently using, such as OCLC's WorldCat or Ex Libris' Alma. This would make the advancements more relatable and tangible. Ethical Considerations and Challenges: The discussion of challenges such as data privacy and bias is commendable, but again, the study lacks specific examples or case studies. Including instances where libraries have faced and addressed these ethical challenges would not only add depth but also serve as practical illustrations for the reader. For instance, citing an example where an AI system in a library inadvertently reinforced existing biases and how it was rectified would provide a concrete context. Future Directions: The section on future directions is promising but could be bolstered with examples of ongoing research or pilot projects. Mentioning specific initiatives or partnerships, such as collaborations between libraries and tech companies, would provide a more comprehensive view of the potential applications and impact of AI.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. Supporting Arguments with Specific Examples: The study leans heavily on theoretical knowledge and existing research studies without grounding its arguments in concrete examples or case studies. For instance, it asserts that AI-driven cataloging systems improve efficiency but fails to provide specific instances where this has been successfully implemented. Including real-world examples, such as how the New York Public Library leverages AI to streamline its cataloging process, would substantially bolster the validity of its claims. The absence of such concrete evidence makes the arguments appear speculative rather than demonstrative. 2. Critical Assessment of Limitations: While the study acknowledges challenges and ethical concerns, it stops short of a thorough critical assessment. A balanced discussion on the potential drawbacks, such as job displacement or over-reliance on AI, would have contributed significantly to the depth and credibility of the study. For example, exploring instances like the controversies surrounding the implementation of AI in the Toronto Public Library, where staff layoffs were linked to AI-driven automation, would provide a more nuanced view. This critical examination is essential for a well-rounded argument. 3. Incorporating Differing Perspectives: By predominantly highlighting the positive impacts of AI on libraries, the study misses the opportunity to present a balanced view. Incorporating counterarguments, such as privacy concerns or the digital divide exacerbated by AI's implementation, would enhance the robustness of the discussion. For instance, contrasting viewpoints such as those from a skeptical librarian could provide valuable insights into potential resistance or challenges from within the library community itself. This addition would lend an air of academic rigor and impartiality to the study. 4. Specificity in Future Directions: The section on future innovations and directions is notably vague and lacks specificity on practical applications. Providing tangible examples or hypothetical scenarios would make this section more compelling. For example, discussing how AI could specifically aid in research assistance by automatically generating literature reviews or facilitating collaboration through tools like AI-driven research networks would illustrate practical applicability. This would help readers envision the transformative potential of AI in a more concrete manner.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	The research study offers an informative perspective on the influence of AI on libraries, yet it lacks sufficient citation support to validate its claims. Here are specific areas where additional sources and concrete examples are necessary to bolster the study's credibility: 1. Technological Advancements in AI : The study discusses various technological advancements but fails to cite specific examples or studies. For instance, when talking about virtual assistants and	

Review Form2

	chatbots, it should mention libraries that have successfully implemented these technologies. Including citations such as "Smith (2020) illustrates the impact of AI-driven chatbots in the XYZ library," or referencing case studies showing increased efficiency and user engagement, would strengthen these claims. 2. Ethical Considerations : Ethical concerns such as data privacy and bias are highlighted, yet there is no mention of actual instances or research studies analyzing these issues within the library context. The inclusion of cases like "Johnson and Lee (2019) study on AI bias in public libraries" would provide a more nuanced understanding and support the discussion. 3. Historical Context and Future Directions : The historical evolution of AI in libraries and future projections are described without much empirical backing. Citations from historical reviews and expert forecasts (e.g., "According to the historical review by Brown (2018)...") would make these sections more authoritative. 4. User-Focused Innovations : The article references user-focused innovations without concrete examples. Specifically citing libraries that have made notable improvements through AI, such as through personalized recommendation systems or automated cataloging, with references to specific impacts, would add weight to the argument. For instance, referencing "The implementation of AI-based recommendation systems at the ABC library (Doe, 2021) resulted in a 20% increase in user satisfaction." 5. Case Studies and Empirical Research : Throughout the study, case studies and empirical research demonstrating the real-world impact of AI are notably absent. The inclusion of well-documented success stories like "The implementation of RFID technology in DEF library as detailed in Miller (2022)..." would provide solid evidence of benefits and challenges. By integrating these additional sources and examples, the study would not only become more credible but also more compelling, offering a detailed, evidence-based exploration of AI's transformative role in libraries.	
--	---	--

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Complex Sentences: While the use of technical language is suitable, some sentences are overly complex, which may hinder understanding. For instance, "This article explores the transformative impact of AI on libraries, including technologies such as machine learning and virtual assistants" could be simplified. Consider breaking it into two sentences for greater clarity: "This article explores the transformative impact of AI on libraries. It includes technologies like machine learning and virtual assistants." 2. Redundancies : The study occasionally uses redundant phrases that could be streamlined for conciseness. For example, "user-focused innovations" and "user engagement" might have overlapping implications. A tighter expression may be "user-centric innovations." 3. Transitions and Flow : While transitions are mostly well-handled, there can be more variety to avoid repetitiveness. Introducing more nuanced transition words beyond "such as" could further smoothen the flow. For example, "This includes" or "Among these innovations," can be used to start sentences introducing examples. 4. Examples and Specificity : Specific examples are used effectively but can be expanded upon to increase depth. The mention of "AI-powered systems automating cataloging" is a good start, but providing a specific case study or example could enhance understanding: "For instance, the University of XYZ's library uses the AI system ABC to automate its cataloging process, reducing human labor by 40%." 5. Ethical Considerations : The study appropriately addresses future directions and ethical considerations, but it should ensure a balanced perspective. Phrases like "providing a glimpse into the future" may be seen as speculative. Using more definitive language backed by current trends and data could provide stronger support: "Current trends suggest AI will continue to develop, influencing key areas such as privacy and data security." 6. Grammar and Syntax : The study generally uses correct grammar, but attention to parallelism in lists can enhance readability. In the sentence "automated cataloging, enhanced search capabilities, digital preservation, and user engagement," using similar grammatical structures (i.e., all gerunds or all nouns) would improve harmony: "automation of cataloging, enhancement of search capabilities, preservation of digital content, and engagement with users."	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript was written by artificial intelligence. 93.57% AI GPT*	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohsen Masoumian Hosseini
Department, University & Country	Canadian Virtual Medical University, Canada