

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_112669
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Transformation in Libraries: A Quantitative Analysis of Technological Adoption and User Impact
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author must revise the whole manuscript keeping in view the scholarly approach for the research community. An improper approach is used to research the implicit objectives. The author must clarify the exact nature of the study to determine its purely quantitative or mixed-method orientations. 2. Seems to me indefinite. The phrase 'user impact' is unfixed. One way to clarify can be: Digital Transformation in Libraries: A Quantitative Analysis of the Adoption of the new Technology and its User Impact. 3. An imprecise abstract. How can the very second sentence of an abstract 'reveal' the findings of the study? The whole abstract should be revised in the scholarly manner. 4. Inappropriate subsections with full of sweeping statements of reporting nature only. A research article must contain a clearly defined section of 'Data Analysis' 5. Unsure. The very first sentence of the article claims the "quantitative analysis of existing literature" and not a single table is provided to report the whole results of the data or sample. 6. Not sufficient and recent. With the exception of Smith and Brown (2018), almost the whole section of literature review revolves around the two studies only i.e., Rogers (2003) and Davis (1989). Moreover, an undefined referencing and citation style is employed in the endorsement of statements. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please improve the reporting style for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Javaid Jamil
Department, University & Country	Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan