

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55283**

Title: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF LIBRARY INFRASTRUCTURE, ICT FACILITIES, AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES IN DEGREE COLLEGE LIBRARIES AFFILIATED TO KUVEMPUR UNIVERSITY OF KARNATAKA

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

✓ **Accept after minor revision.....**

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr ANAM ZEHRA

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

The manuscript addresses an important and practical issue, library infrastructure and ICT readiness in degree colleges, and provides useful descriptive evidence across a sizeable institutional sample. However, it requires revision to correct structural/numbering and reference-format issues and to align hypotheses and conclusions with the stated analysis approach before it is suitable for publication.

Recommendation: Accept after major revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths

- Clear problem focus and relevance:** The study directly targets infrastructure, ICT facilities, and physical resources in degree-college libraries, with a coherent framing in the abstract and introduction.
- Defined objectives and coverage of key domains:** Objectives explicitly span college type/education system, staffing, building nature/size, access systems, furniture adequacy, ICT infrastructure, and physical amenities—matching the study scope well.
- Reasonable institutional sample within the university system:** Covers **60 colleges out of 80** under Kuvempu University, including multiple institutional categories (government, aided, unaided, constituent), supporting meaningful internal comparisons.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Concrete, decision-useful descriptive results:** Tables provide actionable prevalence estimates (e.g., open vs closed access; furniture adequacy; ICT availability), clearly revealing where gaps are concentrated (especially ICT-related furniture and advanced automation).
5. **Practical synthesis and policy orientation:** Findings and conclusions summarize key deficits (infrastructure disparities, non-independent buildings, inadequate amenities, absence of advanced automation) and explicitly call for prioritised development.

Weaknesses

1. **Hypotheses are not supported by the stated analysis approach:** The paper frames hypotheses using “significant variation/association,” but also states it relies on descriptive statistics “without advanced statistical testing,” which is not methodologically aligned with significance claims.
2. **Numbering/formatting inconsistency in methodology sections:** “5. Methodology” contains subsections labeled “6.1–6.4,” indicating template/structure errors that weaken presentation quality.
3. **Measurement clarity is limited:** “Adequacy” categories (highly/moderately/not adequate) are reported, but the manuscript does not show explicit scoring rubrics/benchmarks for these judgments, which constrains reproducibility and interpretability. (Implied by the adequacy reporting without defined criteria in the presented tables/text.)
4. **Data quality risk from self-reported institutional inputs:** The study acknowledges reliance on self-reported institutional data with potential reporting inconsistencies, which can bias estimates of facilities and resources.
5. **Limited external validity beyond the studied system:** The population is restricted to degree colleges under a single university (Kuvempu University). While internal comparisons are useful, transferability to other regions/university systems is not established empirically.