

Peer Review

Review of: "Ethical Dimensions of Artificial Intelligence in Educational Technology and Policy: A Global Bibliometric Analysis (2020–2025)"

Ronal Watrianthos¹

1. Politeknik Negeri Padang, Indonesia

This bibliometric analysis tackles an important and timely topic—AI ethics in educational technology. The research design is sound, and the use of VOSviewer for network analysis is appropriate. However, several key areas need attention to strengthen the paper's impact.

- The paper suffers from numerous grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that impede readability. For example, "AI has shown a vast likelihood of integration" should read "AI shows significant potential for integration." I'd recommend professional proofreading throughout.
- While you mention limitations briefly, be more explicit about the Scopus-only approach potentially missing relevant work in other databases. Also, clarify how you handled the incomplete 2025 data (your analysis was conducted mid-year).
- Figure 1 shows declining publications in 2025, but this isn't adequately explained. Either exclude partial-year data or clearly note the incomplete timeframe. The network visualizations (Figures 2, 3, 4) are difficult to interpret—consider simplifying or providing clearer legends.

Specific Improvements:

- Move beyond describing patterns to critically analyzing what they mean. For instance, what does US dominance in collaboration networks suggest about global equity in AI ethics discourse?
- Your RQ5 findings are valuable but could be more systematically presented. Consider organizing gaps by themes (technical, social, policy) rather than by visualization clusters.

- The conclusion feels generic. Offer specific, actionable recommendations for researchers, policymakers, and educators based on your findings.

This is acceptable work that needs major revisions rather than fundamental restructuring. The core contribution is valuable—mapping this emerging field is genuinely needed—but the paper requires substantial polishing to meet academic standards.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.