

# Strategic Priorities for AI Integration and Digital Transformation in Academic Libraries

Mohsen Moradi<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Khodabakhsh<sup>2\*</sup>, Javad Mehrabi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD student in Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Qa.C., Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Qa.C., Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: M\_khodabakhsh@sbu.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Saman Kamari Songhorabadi Department of Psychology and Cognitive Sciences, University of Trento, Trento, Italy s.kamarisonghorabadi@unitn.it	Reviewer 1: Seyed Mohammad Hosseini Assistant Professor, Department of Health and Rehabilitation in Sports, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: moh_hosseini@sbu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Kamdin Parsakia Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the opening paragraph begins with a broad discussion of government expansion, especially “The historical growth of government, particularly in the United States....” This background is not sufficiently connected to the Judiciary context in Iran. The authors should shorten this general policy-history discussion and move more quickly toward judicial administrative policy implementation, resource scarcity, and optimization-based decision support.

In the Analytical Tools paragraph, BWM, DEMATEL, and CPLEX are named, but the implementation details are absent. For BWM, the authors should report the best and worst criteria, comparison vectors, consistency ratio, and final weight calculation procedure; for DEMATEL, they should report the scale, normalization method, threshold value, direct/total relation matrices, and cause–effect classification.

The Mathematical Optimization Model defines the decision variable as “ $0 \leq x_f \leq 1$ ,” but the interpretation of  $x_f$  as “the proportion of resources allocated to factor  $f$ ” is ambiguous because the sum of all allocations is not constrained to equal 1. The authors should clarify whether  $x_f$  is an intensity level, implementation degree, normalized allocation share, or proportional resource investment; otherwise, Table 3 totals greater than 1 are difficult to interpret.

The model’s composite objective function “ $\text{Max } Z = 0.5z_1 - 0.3(z_2/1000) + 0.2z_3$ ” requires stronger justification. The authors should explain why the scalarization weights are 0.5, 0.3, and 0.2, whether they were elicited from experts or assumed

by researchers, and whether sensitivity analysis was performed to determine whether the optimal solution changes under alternative preference weights.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the manuscript states that “Traditional approaches based on managerial experience or continuation of past allocation patterns are no longer sufficient,” but this claim is asserted rather than empirically demonstrated. The authors should provide either prior empirical evidence, specific examples from judicial administration, or a clearer theoretical explanation of why experience-based allocation fails under multi-objective constraints.

The paragraph beginning “The conceptual background of this study is grounded in public policy analysis, administrative-system pathology, policy evaluation, and multi-objective optimization” combines too many theoretical traditions in a descriptive way. The authors should reorganize this section into a sharper conceptual framework showing how public policy implementation explains the problem, how BWM/DEMATEL quantify factor importance and interdependence, and how optimization converts these inputs into allocation decisions.

The research questions are useful, but the manuscript also presents “the main research hypothesis” that the proposed model can provide “a more balanced and effective resource-allocation pattern... than traditional experience-based allocation approaches.” This is problematic because no empirical comparison with traditional allocation is reported. The authors should either remove the comparative hypothesis or add a benchmark scenario representing traditional allocation and statistically or computationally compare it with the optimized solution.

In the Methods section, the sentence “This study is applied-developmental in nature” is insufficient as a methodological description. The authors should identify the research design more precisely as a quantitative model-development study with expert-based weighting and causal-relationship elicitation, and should explain whether the field study involved interviews, questionnaires, Delphi rounds, document analysis, or expert panels.

The Research Procedure section lists “Stage 1: Identification of key factors through field studies,” but does not explain how the 16 factors were identified, screened, coded, or validated. The authors should report the number and expertise of participants, inclusion criteria for experts, the field-study protocol, the coding or extraction process, and whether content validity indices, expert agreement, or saturation criteria were used.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.