

JLISR Open Peer Review Report

Reviewer Comments and Rebuttal to the Comments

Open Point 開放觀點：開放式同儕評閱機制

本刊新採行「開放觀點」（Open Point）機制，以留存作者與評閱者之間論證的寶貴文字紀錄，並鼓勵雙方在同意公開大部分的評論意見與審查回覆。希冀透過「開放式同儕評閱」（Open Peer Review）模式，提供學者窺見已被刊登文章背後，許多同樣值得被理解與被引用的觀點。這項機制有助於我們的作者、評閱者、讀者享有更真實的學術傳播精華。

審查文章：A qualitative Study of Graduate Students' Perceptions and Use of Library Discovery System and Google Scholar

審稿者：匿名評閱者 A (*僅公開評閱意見)

匿名評閱者 B (*僅公開評閱意見)

主編綜評

作者：陳世娟 Shih-Chuan Chen

刊登卷期：19(2)

D O I：

說明：◎評閱者；★主編；●作者

審查階段 初審

審稿者：匿名審稿者 A

評閱意見：

This is a qualitative study interviewing 15 graduate students from a variety of disciplines on their use and perception of Google Scholar and the library discovery systems. The manuscript is well-written and easy to follow. The results ought to be of interest to the readership of this journal.

1. The authors cited a study back in 2011 to state that Google Scholar's scope remained unclear. Given the rapid change of the Internet landscape, one wonders if this is still the case. Can the authors provide progresses, in any, that has been made regarding making the scope more transparent by Google scholar? ◦
 - 作者回覆：The following articles have been added as supplements.
Google Scholar does not publicly disclose the specific journals it indexes; however, Martín et al. (2021) conducted a study examining 3,073,351 citations from 2515 highly cited English articles published since 2006, spanning 252 subject categories. Their research revealed that Google Scholar identified 88% of these citations, including many that were not detected by other sources, and nearly all of those identified by other databases (89–94%). The comprehensive nature of information displayed by Google Scholar was underscored. In a related study, Gusenbauer (2022) proposed a new scientometric method to assess the subject coverage of various prominent English-centric academic bibliographic repositories, comparing coverage across 56 databases. The findings indicated that Google Scholar boasts the most extensive subject coverage among the databases analyzed.
2. The collections indexed by library discovery systems and Google Scholar differ significantly. Google Scholar primarily focuses on journal articles, while library discovery systems excel in providing access to monographs. Such variations in coverage could influence perceptions of these systems across various disciplines. The authors noted that the 15 participants in their study represented 15 different disciplines. Could the authors specify which disciplines were included? If we broadly categorize these disciplines into social sciences/humanities and STEM, what would the distribution be? Given that researchers from these two categories rely on these systems to varying extents, did the authors consider whether disciplinary differences, even

broadly defined, might be a confounding factor? For example, participant J stated that s/he relied mostly on books, which made Google Scholar less useful for her/him.

- **作者回覆：** This is a good and reasonable question, but it fails to take advantage of disciplinary differences as the subject areas are quite fragmented. However, the identity of Participant J increases the possibility of describing disciplinary differences. (p. 6)

Subject field backgrounds include: School of Foreign Languages (Department of Spanish Literature), School of Social Sciences (Department of Sociology, Department of Psychology), School of Management (Department of Accounting, Department of Business Management), School of People's Livelihood (Department of Hospitality and Hospitality Management, Department of Nutritional Science), School of Medicine (Department of Clinical Psychology), School of Arts (Department of Applied Arts), School of Liberal Arts (Department of Philosophy, Department of History), School of Communication (Department of Mass Communication), School of Education (Department of Library and Information Science), School of Law (Department of Finance and Economics) Department of Law), Polytechnic (Department of Information Engineering).

3. The research stages the participants was in at the time of the interview might also influence their reliance and perception of the two systems. Did the authors consider the possibility that the participants might have been in different stages of the research cycle, which, might in turn influence their perception of the two systems? Or maybe this could be noted as a topic for future research?
 - **作者回覆：** Thanks to the reviewer for the comments. It is mentioned in (p.13), "Due to the different requirements of departments on the types of paper materials, they will use Library Discovery Systems and Google Scholar at different stages." However, since the interviewees were all using Library Discovery System for the first time, they mentioned (p.12) that if they wrote another paper, they would use Library Discovery System analysis more frequently in the later stages of document writing. Future topics can be studied in different stages.
4. As the authors pointed out, snowballing or backward and forward chaining is important means by which research find relevant articles, probably more so than subject search. Google scholar being a citation database is much more superior in this regard. Might this also influence the users' perceptions of the tool?

- 作者回覆：Thank you to the reviewer for recommending the inclusion of this section in the Discussion.
5. Table 1 list the participants' evaluation of the two resources, could the authors clarify how the question was phrased? It's not clear from what perspectives or based on what criteria these two systems were evaluated.
- 作者回覆：Thank you to the reviewer for your comments. Table 1 will be removed following careful consideration.
6. On page 7 “graduate students believe that Google Scholar has a wider coverage in terms of experience...” Not sure what “experience” mean here?
- 作者回覆：After careful consideration, this section of the dialogue has been omitted along with Table 1. We appreciate the reviewer's input.
7. A noteworthy finding is that the students found it difficult to access the relevance of the books without sufficient bibliographic information (page 9). I think this is something that one can suggest for the improvement of the library discovery systems. As the participants pointed out, a ready-made citation link can also be very helpful.
- 作者回覆：Thanks to the reviewer's suggestion, a description has been incorporated into the conclusion section. (p.13)
8. The authors concluded that the library discovery system should not necessarily compete with Google Scholar. Has there been any indications that these two are competing with each other? They are just different resources serving different purposes, they complement, instead of competing with each other.
- 作者回覆：The wording on page 13 has been revised following the suggestion made by the reviewer. Thanks. ◦

審稿者：匿名審稿者 B

評閱意見：

1. The topic of the paper is important for the LIS field. The research is original and it provides insightful suggestions for research and practice. Some suggestions for revision are offered for the author's reference.

- 作者回覆：**Thanks.**

2. There are some inconsistencies in the term use, such as graduate students, master's students, and postgraduate students. It is suggested that the author be consistent with the term use.

- 作者回覆：**Revised following the reviewer's suggestions. Thanks.**

3. Since this was a qualitative study, the reviewer suggests that the author amend RQ1 as follows:

How do the library resource discovery system and Google Scholar meet the research needs of graduate students?

- 作者回覆：**Revised following the reviewer's suggestions. Thanks.**

4. The author has provided a succinct description of the context on which the research was based. It would be good if the author could strengthen the significance of this study in the Introduction section.

- 作者回覆：**Revised following the reviewer's suggestions on p. 2. Thanks.**

5. In the concluding paragraph of the Literature Review section, the author has identified the gap in the research for filling. It is suggested that the author go a bit further to justify why the gap is worth further investigation and then point out what this study intended to do and why it was important to compare the library discovery system and Google Scholar.

- 作者回覆：**Revised following the reviewer's suggestions on p. 5. Thanks.**

6. The Methodology section requires more details in terms of data collection and analysis. It is suggested that the author add more information about the sampling strategy adopted and recruitment process. How were the interview questions designed and mapped onto the research questions? What qualitative data analysis approach was used in this study? It would be good if the author can add some description to explain how the data gathered were classified and analysed, with concrete examples for each data analysis stage.

- 作者回覆：**Revised following the reviewer's suggestions on p. 5-6. Thanks.**

7. The results are presented in a clear way, with a lot of details. A small suggestion for the layout of the finding: in addition to using block quotes from

participants, it is suggested that the author embed participants' quotes in the description sometimes. The author can also consider reducing the number of block quotes in order to increase readability.

- 作者回覆：**Thank you to the reviewer for your comments. The revised section has already been modified.**
8. The author may consider whether Table 1 is necessary.
- 作者回覆：**Thank you to the reviewer for your comments. Table 1 will be removed following careful consideration.**
9. The Discussion section is well written.
- 作者回覆：**Thanks.**
10. In the Conclusion section, the author has acknowledged the limitations of this study. It is suggested that the author add suggestions for future research.
- 作者回覆：**Thanks to the reviewer for the comments. Add suggestions for future research in p.13**

主編綜評

評閱意見：

評閱者肯定本文研究議題的創新性與研究價值，不過仍提出相關意見，請請謹慎回應兩位審查者建議，特別是評閱者 1 提出不少觀點，可參考與辯證以提升本文重要的發現亮點。

1. 兩位評閱者對於研究問題改善、受試者的選擇、背景都有疑問；此外評估任務的設計以及評估是如何進行？請作者務必在這部分能夠進行補強與修訂。
2. 兩位評閱者都建議本研究新增未來研究議題以補充目前無法回應的部分
3. 評閱者 1 對於引用 2011 年 Google Scholar 的文獻存在疑義，建議說明或者尋找更近代的代表文獻。
4. 請作者將英文摘要修訂為 300 字以內一個段落流暢的文字並補充 300 字以內的中文摘要。

● 作者回覆：謝謝主編的建議，已根據審查者意見進行修改，謝謝！

審查階段

複審 1

審稿者：匿名審稿者 A

評閱意見：

I wonder why the authors decided to remove Table 1, I was hoping the authors could provide exact wordings of these question items. I believe it will go a long way helping the readers understand the findings.

The authors pointed out that the participants found the results from Google scholar too numerous to manage. Don't they have the same issue of information overload when using library discovery systems? For queries that produce too much results, ranking and search fields filtering become even more important. With Google Scholar, one gets to rank the results by results and citation impacts. In addition, basic filtering functions such as years of publications and languages were provided. How does library discovery system rank the results? And what filtering functions does it provide. The ranking and search fields obviously have significant impacts on users' responses to the results.

- 作者回覆：Thank you for the suggestions from the reviewers. Another reviewer recommended deleting Table 1, so an explanation of this part will be added to the article. Regarding information overload, interviewees believe that Google Scholar may lead to information overload, while the Library Discovery System confirms the availability of resources in the school. Therefore, there are differences in how they are used, which will also be explained in the article (p.8).

主編綜評

評閱意見：

評閱者對於本文仍存有疑慮，建議作者能針對評閱者的兩個主要問題進行調整與回答。

- 作者回覆：已針對問題調整內容於 p8.謝謝!

審查階段

複審 2

審稿者：匿名審稿者 A

評閱意見：

The authors enumerate the differences in perceptions and usages between Google Scholar and the Library Discovery System, but the current arrangement of these points is somewhat difficult to follow. To enhance clarity, the author may consider revisiting their research questions to better structure and align the discussion of these differences.

Research Questions:

RQ1: How do the Library Resource Discovery System and Google Scholar meet the research needs of graduate students?

RQ2: Under what circumstances do graduate students use the Library Resource Discovery System or Google Scholar?

RQ3: How do graduate students perceive the importance of the Library Resource Discovery System and Google Scholar?

- 作者回覆：Thank you to the reviewers for their suggestions. I have made slight adjustments to the order and content of the research questions and subsequent discussions. The analysis has also been outlined roughly based on the research questions and marked in red in the document.

RQ1: How do the Library Discovery System and Google Scholar meet the research needs of graduate students?

RQ2: How do graduate students perceive the importance of the Library Discovery System and Google Scholar?

RQ3: What are graduate students' opinions and suggestions on Library Discovery System and Google Scholar?

主編綜評

評閱意見：

評閱者建議作者能夠根據研究問題適度調整後續的討論排序一致，以提升論文可讀性。請作者以獨立檔案回覆審查意見並修改本文。

- 作者回覆：謝謝主編的意見，已針對評閱者的建議調整研究問題及後續討論的順序，謝謝！

審查階段

複審 3

審稿者：匿名審稿者 A

評閱意見：

I believe that the authors have properly addressed the questions that I have raised.

主編綜評

評閱意見：

評閱者肯定作者的修訂與論文貢獻，請作者提供以下資訊後以利後續處理

1. 請於論文增加 300 字以內中文摘
2. 請補充作者完整資訊，並參考以下 17(2)文章排列作者單位等，中英文摘要相關資訊 Using a Holistic Approach to Evaluate the Digital Humanities System for Parliamentary Information / Shu-Lai Chou, Yu-Jung Cheng
https://www.lac.org.tw/sites/default/files/field_files/publish/172_4_Using%20a%20Holistic%20Approach%20to%20Evaluate%20the%20Digital%20Humanities%20System%20for%20Parliamentary%20Information.pdf
3. 參考以上文章調整論文標題格式，以利後續文章編排
4. 本刊將在收到修訂論文後發送接受通知函
5. 本刊試行公開審閱，請問作者是否同意公開審閱內容？