



Review A of Analyzing the adoption of Artificial Intelligence in modern library services: a Technology Acceptance Model perspective

Rene Faustino Gabriel Junior

<https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-5245.32.148462A>

Reviewed article: DURODOLU, Oluwole Olumide; ADIGUN, Ganiyu Ojo. Analyzing the adoption of Artificial Intelligence in modern library services: a Technology Acceptance Model perspective. **Em Questão**, Porto Alegre, v. 32, e-148462, 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1808-5245.32.148462>

REVIEW

Completed on: 2025-10-28 09:09 AM

Recommendation: Mandatory corrections

1. Adequacy to the editorial profile of Em Questão: *

Good

2. Relevance of the topic:*

Excellent

3. Originality in approaching the topic:*

Good

4. Contribution to Information Science:*

Good

5. Remarks regarding relevance, originality and contribution to the area of knowledge:

The paper aims to analyze the adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in modern library services through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).

The general objective is to understand the factors that influence the acceptance and integration of AI in library contexts.

The specific objectives include evaluating the perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, behavioral intention, and actual usage of AI-based services, and to propose strategies for effective implementation within libraries

In summary, the study intends to apply TAM as a theoretical lens to understand behavioral and technological factors that explain the adoption of AI in library environments.

6. Quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework:*

Excellent

7. Remarks regarding quality and appropriateness of the theoretical framework:

The references are current (mostly from 2019–2023), ensuring temporal relevance.

However, the review relies almost exclusively on international literature, with no regional or contextual analysis (e.g., Latin American or Global South perspectives).

The theoretical sources are credible, yet the lack of conceptual delimitation of “AI” results in diffuse arguments.

No missing citations were detected.

8. Relevance and adequacy of methodological procedures:*

Excellent

9. Clarity in presenting and detailing methodological procedures: *

Good

10. Remarks regarding methodological procedures:

2. Alignment Between Title and Objectives

The title and objectives are conceptually aligned; both emphasize AI adoption in libraries under the TAM framework.

However, the scope of the study is overly broad. Artificial Intelligence is a vast and multidisciplinary domain encompassing several subfields such as machine learning, deep learning, computer vision, natural language processing (NLP), and large language models (LLMs).

The manuscript treats AI as a generic construct, without specifying which technological domain or subfield is under investigation.

This lack of delimitation weakens both the methodological focus and the theoretical depth of the study.

To strengthen the paper, the author should clearly define the subarea of AI addressed — for instance, LLM-based systems (e.g., chatbots, virtual assistants) or deep learning models — to allow for a more precise and meaningful analysis.

3. Methodology

The study employs a qualitative, descriptive, and literature-based approach, relying on content analysis of existing academic works.

Databases consulted include Google Scholar, JSTOR, LISA, and ProQuest, with inclusion/exclusion criteria and a temporal scope (2013–2023).

Strengths:

- *Clear inclusion and exclusion criteria.*
- *Transparency in data sources and recognition of methodological limitations.*

Weaknesses:

- *The methodology lacks detail regarding how the qualitative analysis was conducted (coding process, analytical categories, or tools used).*
- *There is no indication of the number of studies reviewed or the criteria for data saturation.*
- *The AI domain is undefined, preventing replication or assessment of the study's depth.*

- *The research remains purely descriptive, without empirical validation or triangulation.*

6. Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Modern Library Services, Technology Acceptance Model, Technology, Perceived Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness.

While thematically appropriate, the keywords are redundant (e.g., “Technology” and “Technology Acceptance Model”) and too general.

The paper would benefit from including more specific descriptors such as Large Language Models (LLMs), Chatbots, Digital Libraries, or Human–AI Interaction, depending on the refined scope of the study.

11. Rationality and discussion of results and coherence of conclusions:*

Excellent

12. Remarks regarding the results and conclusions.

The discussion is organized around the TAM constructs — perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, behavioral intention, and actual use.

The section integrates recent literature (2020–2023) and acknowledges behavioral factors influencing technology adoption. However, the analysis is largely narrative and summarizing, with limited interpretation or critical synthesis.

13. Quality of argumentation (clarity, conciseness, objectivity), textual correction and text structure:*

Good

14. Remarks regarding the language and writing of the text:

Linguistic and Formatting Evaluation

The paper is written in English but exhibits syntactic inconsistencies and signs of automated translation, which affect readability and academic tone.

The citation format follows APA style, not ABNT, and does not conform to the referencing standards expected in Brazilian or international journals that require strict formatting.

A comprehensive language and style revision is necessary, ensuring terminological consistency and formal academic English.

Originality and Contribution

The manuscript addresses a contemporary and relevant theme, but its originality is limited.

It does not present empirical data, case studies, or methodological innovation.

Its main contribution lies in summarizing and reaffirming the applicability of TAM to AI adoption in libraries, but without advancing the theoretical discussion to the new paradigms of AI (e.g., generative models, explainability, or trust frameworks).

10. Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths

- *Topical and socially relevant theme.*
- *Well-structured literature review.*
- *Consistent alignment with the TAM theoretical framework.*
- *Up-to-date references (mostly post-2019).*

Weaknesses

- *Absence of clear delimitation of AI subfield (LLM, NLP, deep learning, etc.).*
- *Overly generic treatment of the AI concept.*
- *Lack of empirical data or analytical depth.*
- *Descriptive rather than analytical writing.*
- *Inconsistency in language and style (scientific style).*
- *Non-compliance with journal formatting standards.*
- *Limited originality and weak critical discussion.*

*15. What is your recommendation on accepting the article?**

Accept it with corrections (specify below).

16. Specify the suggested changes and/or justify the non-acceptance.*

The manuscript “Analyzing the Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in Modern Library Services: A Technology Acceptance Model Perspective” addresses an important and emerging research topic in Library and Information Science.

However, it requires substantial conceptual and methodological revision before it can be considered for publication.

The author(s) should:

- 1. Define the specific subarea of AI being analyzed (e.g., LLMs, chatbots, deep learning, etc.).*
- 2. Clarify and detail the methodological procedures used in the literature analysis.*
- 3. Conduct a linguistic and formatting revision (APA/ABNT compliance).*
- 4. Provide contextualization for regional or institutional realities.*
- 5. Enhance critical discussion and theoretical delimitation, possibly integrating newer models beyond TAM (e.g., UTAUT2, trust and ethics frameworks).*
- 6. Clearly indicate authorship and institutional affiliation.*

Final Recommendation:

Major Revision Required (Revisions and Resubmission Suggested)

The paper is thematically relevant but methodologically and conceptually weak in its current form.

Its publication potential depends on a clear delimitation of the AI field under study, a more rigorous analytical structure, and a comprehensive linguistic and formal revision.

Recommendation: MANDATORY CORRECTIONS

