

# Review of: "Chatbots: A review of their potential applications in library services"

Carla Lewis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Calgary

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The grammar needs to be reviewed closely. The tone and flow in and between paragraphs feels stilted. A few pass throughs and minor edits should be able to rectify this. Spelling needs to be reviewed. An example of this is in the abstract, the use of 'revels' when 'reveals' should be used.

The introduction is concise, providing definitions and details about Chatbots. The authors can consider providing the reader with the paper's thesis, the research gap being addressed, and how the paper will progress. A separate paragraph can include a definition and the various features of Chatbots. There could be more detail about library services, to delineate what services are being included.

In addition to the sentence, "These tools can be tailor made to provide various services and facilities.", a follow up sentence could elaborate on the features or how the bots can be customized for different environments.

For the paragraph about Social Chatbot Relationships, can the readers be pointed to a chatbot that currently employs this? A real life example will give readers a demonstration of the features that help distinguish chatbots that employ SCR versus those that do not.

For the paragraph, "Since the last decade, academic libraries in developing countries have been experimenting with chatbots. In 2010, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln created the chatbot "Pixel" for the use in its library. In 2013, the University of California-Irvine created the chatbot named "ANTswers". As more chatbot developers integrate AI and natural language processing (NLP), chatbots are better equipped to handle sophisticated information requests.", are these bots still being used at these institutions, or have they been abandoned? Are there more recent examples of libraries creating their own chatbots? Are public libraries creating and utilizing them?

The discussion about the benefits of chatbots is good. However, it would be worthwhile to include some of the drawbacks and reasons why libraries may not utilize chatbots, such as cost, staff time and monitoring, technical knowledge, etc. It would provide some balance, even if it is only a couple of sentences stating that there is recognition of potential limitations or drawbacks.

How were the 17 chatbots that were analyzed selected? Please provide more details as to why certain ones were included/selected and others excluded, aside from the fact that there are too many chatbots in the public domain.

Are there additional pieces that can be added to the analysis of the chatbots? Are there unique features or customizations

that can be made? What or how many libraries currently utilize a specific chatbot?

There is a lack of citations and support for the statements and arguments being made in sections 4 to 6. It would be beneficial to provide a deeper analysis of the findings and discussing the implications for LIS services.