

TABLE OF REVISIONS

Information Literacy for Digital Citizens: Examining the Role of Community Libraries in Reducing Misinformation

Response to Reviewer C and Reviewer D — Encontros Bibli | Revision prepared March 2026

#	Reviewer	Location in Manuscript	Issue Raised by Reviewer	Action Taken / Revision Description
1	C & D	Abstract / Introduction (para 2)	"Misinformation" and "disinformation" not defined or distinguished operationally, despite both appearing in the performance task.	Added new paragraph explicitly defining misinformation (false content shared without intent to deceive) vs. disinformation (deliberately fabricated/manipulated content). Tracked insertion with comment marker.
2	C	Objective (Abstract)	Objective does not mention "digital citizens" which appears in the title — conceptual misalignment.	Added "digital citizens" into the objective statement via tracked insertion: "to foster information literacy (IL) among digital citizens and to counter misinformation."
3	C	NEW Section 2 (before Methodology)	No dedicated Theoretical Framework section. Reviewer C requested a structured section before Methodology covering key theoretical constructs.	Inserted full Section 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK with three subsections: 2.1 Critical Information Literacy & Situated Digital Literacies; 2.2 Lateral Reading & Misinformation Assessment; 2.3 Critical Pedagogy & Community-Based Learning (including Freire 1970/2005). All text as tracked insertions.
4	D	NEW Section 2.2 (Theoretical Framework)	Lateral reading (Werner Axelsson & Nygren, 2024) cited but not sufficiently developed despite being fundamental to the Phase 2 performance assessment instrument.	Dedicated subsection 2.2 provides full theoretical grounding: definition of lateral reading, contrast with vertical reading, evidence of teachability (Werner Axelsson & Nygren, 2024), and explicit justification for performance-based assessment over self-report alone.
5	D	NEW Section 2.3 (Theoretical Framework) + Discussion 4.1	Critical Pedagogy listed as keyword but not theoretically grounded. Freire is an indispensable reference and his absence weakens the discussion section.	Subsection 2.3 introduces Freire (1970/2005) and problem-posing education as the theoretical foundation. Additional paragraph in Discussion 4.1 applies Freirean analysis to the neutrality-CIL tension, showing how problem-posing avoids the legitimacy anxiety without diluting CIL's transformative potential. Freire reference added to bibliography.

#	Reviewer	Location in Manuscript	Issue Raised by Reviewer	Action Taken / Revision Description
6	D	Section 4.4 — Contribution, Limitations & Future Directions	No discussion of potential social desirability effects from on-site administration of PIL Scale by research assistants.	Added new paragraph: explains mechanism of social desirability bias, situates it in the on-site data collection procedure, discusses its implication for the self-efficacy/performance miscalibration finding ($r = .28$ may be an upper bound), and recommends anonymous collection + social desirability covariate for future studies.
7	C & D	Section 4.3 — Critical Appraisal of Community Anchor Framework	Section 4.3 too brief for a study whose primary output is the framework. Needs success criteria, minimum implementation conditions, and measurable indicators per pillar.	Added substantial new paragraph with per-pillar implementation specifications: Reframe (professional development, role-identity instrument); Connect (volunteer protocol, institutional partnerships, 12-month sustainability indicator); Facilitate (facilitation formats, pre/post performance task for skill transfer). Framed as transforming framework from conceptual to longitudinally evaluable.
8	D	Section 2.2 Ethical Considerations	First-person plural: "our data management plan" — inconsistent with impersonal scientific register required by journal.	Tracked deletion of "our", tracked insertion of "the study's": → "in line with the study's data management plan."
9	D	Section 2.4 Data Collection (Phase 2 survey EFA passage)	First-person plural: "aligning with our theoretical dimensions" — impersonal register required.	Tracked deletion of "our", tracked insertion of "the": → "aligning with the theoretical dimensions."
10	D	Discussion Section 4.1	First-person plural: "Our findings reveal that in this context..." — impersonal register required.	Tracked deletion of "Our findings reveal", tracked insertion of "The findings reveal".
11	D	References — NOTLEY et al.	Formatting inconsistency: journal title 'Comunicar' in bold (not italic); year '(2023)' placed after article number rather than in standard ABNT position; 'youtube' not capitalized; 'Implications' should be lowercase sentence case.	Corrected to ABNT standard: journal title changed from bold to italic; date repositioned; 'YouTube' capitalized; 'implications' lowercase; volume/issue format corrected to: Comunicar, [s. l.], v. 31, n. 77, Article 114837, 2023.
12	D	References — NEW entry	Freire (1970/2005) referenced in new theoretical content but absent from bibliography.	Added: FREIRE, P. Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th anniversary ed., M. B. Ramos, Trans.). [S. l.]: Continuum, 1970/2005. — inserted alphabetically between FETTERS and FLYNN.

ITEMS REQUIRING AUTHOR DECISION (Not Implemented as Tracked Changes)

#	Reviewer	Location in Manuscript	Issue Raised by Reviewer	Action Taken / Revision Description
13	C	Title	Reviewer C suggests incorporating contextual delimitation into title (West Sumatra / Indonesia) since article is empirical.	Flagged with reviewer comment in document. Authors to decide whether to revise: e.g., 'Information Literacy for Digital Citizens: Community Libraries and Misinformation in West Sumatra, Indonesia.' No tracked change made pending author decision.
14	C	Section 3.3 / Results — Community Anchor	Community Anchor framework: not clear whether it is a conceptual model derived from research or an empirically validated model.	Flagged with comment. Authors should explicitly state (in Section 3.3 or 4.3): 'The Community Anchor framework is a conceptual model co-developed through participatory research and awaiting longitudinal empirical validation.' This is already partially implied but should be explicit.
15	C	Conclusions	Reviewer C requests expanded interpretive reach around 'agents of epistemic resilience' from the data.	Flagged with comment. Authors to expand the epistemic resilience concept with specific data-derived evidence (e.g., which patron behaviors or library practices most directly support this framing).

LEGEND: ✓ Done = Tracked change implemented in manuscript file | ⚠ Authors to decide/add = Flagged with comment in manuscript, requires author judgement before resubmission