

Peer Review

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

Şule Yılmaz Özden¹

1. Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey

This manuscript addresses a critically relevant and significant subject by exploring the ethical implications of artificial intelligence in the realm of educational technology and education policy. In order to thoroughly identify research trends, collaborative networks, and gaps in the field, the study performed a bibliometric analysis of 342 papers published in Scopus between 2020 and 2025. The paper's worldwide and interdisciplinary approach is a significant strength that sets it apart from other research in the field.

However, there are several areas where the manuscript could be further strengthened. First, the methodology section requires greater clarity. The bibliometric analysis process should be explained in more detail, particularly regarding which bibliometric techniques were employed and how they were applied. I encourage the authors to consult methodological resources such as Donthu et al. (2021) on bibliometric analysis techniques, which provide a comprehensive overview of methodological options and their implications (see: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296321003155>).

Second, while the search terms used capture certain dimensions, they could be broadened to better reflect ethical debates related to educational administration, child development, and cultural diversity. This would allow the study to capture a wider scope of research contributions.

Third, although the findings' keyword clusters are significant, a more thorough interpretation and more robust policy implications would enhance the conversation. For example, more thorough examination and context are needed for ethical issues like children's data rights and academic honesty. Currently,

certain findings are presented in a somewhat generic manner with little connection to specific ramifications for institutions, educators, and legislators.

In addition, while the literature review cites relevant global ethics reports (e.g., GDPR, Ada Lovelace Institute), the theoretical framing would be enriched by including education-specific ethical frameworks, such as the UNESCO (2023) “AI in Education” guidelines and OECD policy documents.

Regarding the collaboration networks, the findings are interesting but occasionally overstated. For example, the claim that the United States appears minimally engaged seems inconsistent with its central position in the visualizations provided. I recommend revising such interpretations to avoid overgeneralization. Also, there is a need for a strong synthesis of findings.

Finally, the manuscript would benefit from language refinement to improve readability, correction of typographical errors, and clearer explanations of the figures so that readers without bibliometric expertise can better interpret them.

Overall, this is a valuable and promising contribution to the literature on AI ethics in education. Nevertheless, the paper requires substantial revisions to address methodological limitations, enrich its theoretical grounding, and provide more concrete implications for policy and practice.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.