

**REVIEWER'S REPORT**

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55565

Title: Unpacking Academic Confusion: Social Media, Social Networking, Search Engines, and AI at ULPGL — A Digital Literacy Theory Approach

Recommendation:

Accept as it is
 Accept after minor revision.....
Accept after major revisionyes.....
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr.shaweta sachdeva

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The manuscript requires substantial language editing to improve clarity, conciseness, and academic tone; although the ideas are strong, sentence complexity, redundancy, and occasional grammatical inconsistencies reduce readability and should be professionally revised.
2. The concept of “academic confusion” should be more sharply operationalized; while it is richly described, clearer analytical boundaries and a concise conceptual definition early in the paper would strengthen theoretical coherence.
3. The novelty and scholarly contribution need to be stated more explicitly in the introduction, clearly distinguishing how this study advances digital literacy theory beyond existing qualitative and conceptual work.
4. The rationale for selecting ULPGL as a single intrinsic case should be further strengthened by explicitly clarifying its theoretical representativeness and limits of transferability to other Global South or comparable institutional contexts.
5. Although the qualitative methodology is generally sound, the sampling logic requires clearer justification, particularly regarding participant balance across groups and how data saturation was determined.
6. Greater transparency is needed in the data analysis process; examples of coding, theme development, or an illustrative coding table would significantly enhance methodological rigor and trustworthiness.
7. Direct participant quotations should be more systematically integrated into the findings to strengthen the empirical grounding of the four thematic portraits.
8. The linkage between empirical findings and the seven-domain digital literacy framework should be made more explicit through clearer analytical mapping rather than largely interpretive narrative transitions.
9. The discussion section would benefit from deeper critical engagement with competing or contradictory findings in the literature, rather than predominantly confirmatory alignment.
10. The implementation roadmap, while valuable, currently reads as policy-oriented guidance; it should be more clearly framed as analytically derived implications rather than prescriptive recommendations alone.
11. Limitations should be expanded to explicitly address researcher positionality, potential power dynamics in interviews, and the implications of studying AI practices in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.
12. The reference list requires careful technical correction, including removal of duplicated DOIs, formatting inconsistencies, and verification of citation accuracy and relevance.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

13. The manuscript would benefit from a tightening of overall length by reducing repetition across sections (particularly between introduction, discussion, and conclusion) while preserving analytical depth.
14. With these substantial revisions addressing conceptual precision, methodological transparency, analytical depth, and presentation quality, the manuscript has strong potential to make a meaningful contribution and would be suitable for publication.