Application of the Internet of Things in Information Resource Supply Chain Management: A Model for Information Centers in Iran

Sedigheh Siahsarani Salah ol Din Kola[1], Hajar Zarei[1*], Seyed Rasool Toudar[1]

[1] Department of Information Science and Knowledge Studies, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Hajarzarei@iau.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Leila Youzbashi	Reviewer 1: Hooman Namvar
Department of sport science,	Assisstant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad
Faculty of Humanities, University	University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir
of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran	Reviewer 2: Farhad Namjoo
l.youzbashi@znu.ac.ir	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the statement "According to internal studies, it can be said that the importance and potential of IoT in Iran have not yet been fully understood…" would benefit from referencing specific internal studies or empirical data to substantiate this claim.

In paragraph two of the Introduction, you mention IoT "facilitating paradigm shifts in various fields…" (Reblo et al., 2022; Rajab et al., 2020). Consider briefly specifying what these paradigm shifts entail or providing concrete examples to strengthen the statement.

In the Methods section, the sampling process is described as "purposeful interviews with 15 experts," but there is no discussion on the inclusion/exclusion criteria or justification of sample size. Please clarify why 15 participants were deemed sufficient.

In the Discussion, you reference numerous studies (Zarandi et al., 2022, etc.) to support findings, but do not critically compare your results to these works. Consider including discussion on any contradictions or new contributions relative to past studies.

In the Discussion, the sentence "Librarians could receive training on designing and implementing IoT systems in libraries…" is very descriptive; however, it reads more like recommendations. Consider distinguishing this as a practical implication rather than part of the discussion of findings.

In the Conclusion, the section is somewhat lengthy and repeats elements from the Discussion. Consider condensing this section and focusing on the broader implications and key takeaways.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Methods section, the sentence "Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was achieved with 12 participants" could be elaborated by describing how saturation was determined operationally.

In the Methods section, you state the use of thematic analysis based on Braun and Clarke (2006). It would strengthen the methodological rigor if you specify the phases of thematic analysis applied and how coding reliability or bias was controlled.

In the Findings section, Table 1 lists overarching, organizing, and basic themes, but does not clearly explain how these categories emerged from the data. Consider adding a narrative explanation linking the coding process to this table.

In the Findings, demographic data (percentages on gender, education, etc.) are presented, but the implications of these demographics on findings are not discussed. You might reflect on how participant characteristics could influence the themes.

In the Findings section, you mention "178 initial codes were extracted," but it would help readers to include a brief example of an initial code and how it was merged into themes for transparency.

In the Methods, you mention "analyzing the explicit and latent content," but do not describe how latent content analysis differed from explicit analysis. Clarifying this distinction would strengthen methodological transparency.

The Discussion section includes extensive technical detail (e.g., explanation of Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, high-bandwidth internet). Consider focusing instead on implications for theory, practice, and policy rather than reiterating technical functions.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.