

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

Sirje Virkus¹

¹ Tallinn University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper lacks proper referencing, insufficiently explained results, absence of references in specific sub-sections, and a perceived lack of depth.

1. **Lack of supported arguments:** One significant issue raised about the paper is the presence of arguments that lack proper references. While the specific arguments are not mentioned, the reviewer asserts that this omission transforms the paper into an opinion piece rather than a research paper. This is a valid concern, as a research paper should be based on credible sources and evidence to support the presented arguments. Without proper referencing, the paper's credibility and reliability may be compromised.
2. **Results without explanation or comparison:** Another criticism is directed towards the absence of explanations or comparisons in the table of results. It is essential to provide an in-depth analysis and contextualization of the data presented, allowing readers to understand the significance of the findings. By merely presenting a table without proper explanation or comparison, the paper fails to fulfill this requirement, which hampers its overall comprehensibility and impact.
3. **Absence of references in sub-sections:** The reviewer highlights that sub-sections 4.1 to 4.6 lack references. This is concerning since references are crucial for establishing the foundation of research and indicating the sources from which the information is derived. The lack of references in these sub-sections raises questions about the paper's rigor and the validity of the presented information. It also makes it difficult for readers to verify or explore further details regarding the specific topics addressed in these sub-sections.
4. **Need for extensive elaboration:** The reviewer suggests that the paper requires extensive elaboration to meet the standards of a proper research paper. This observation implies that the current level of detail and analysis provided is insufficient. For a research paper to be considered comprehensive and valuable, it should present a thorough exploration of the topic, incorporate relevant literature, and provide a critical evaluation of the research findings. By lacking these aspects, the paper falls short of meeting the expectations of a high-quality research paper.
5. **Opinion paper vs. research paper:** The final critique asserts that the paper appears more like an opinion piece rather than a research paper. This judgment likely stems from the combination of the aforementioned issues, such as unsupported arguments, lack of elaboration, and inadequate referencing. A research paper should be grounded in evidence, rigorously analysed, and contribute to the existing body of knowledge. Without these qualities, the paper may be perceived as an opinion piece with a mere list of available chatbots.

Based on the provided criticisms, it is evident that the requires significant improvements to be considered a high-quality research paper. The lack of proper referencing, insufficient explanations and comparisons of results, absence of references in sub-sections, and the need for extensive elaboration collectively weaken the paper's credibility and impact. Addressing these concerns through rigorous research, in-depth analysis, and thorough referencing will be essential to elevate the paper to the standards expected of a proper research contribution.