

# Review of: "The Relationship Between AI Tools and Their Aspects in Higher Education"

Daniel Balsalobre Lorente<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Castilla La Mancha

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Can be acceptable after some comments

1. The Introduction fails to motivate the study. In the present form, it resembles a mini-review of literature, rather than discussing any policy-level problem. Why is this study necessary? What policy-level problem is this study addressing? How is the study expected to provide any solution to that problem? How does the choice of sample complement that problem? Are the results and policies generalizable? The introduction is silent on all these aspects. The mere choice of new variables, new methods, or a new context is not a contribution of a study.

Try to find out the policy-level problem persisting in the chosen countries from third-party research reports, as academic literature will not be able to provide you with the specific policy issue.

2. What is the aim of the review of literature? The authors have merely listed the studies without even creating a debate among them. The research gap cannot be substantiated without that debate and thoughtful contradictions.

4. The authors can provide more recent references.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2023.03.017>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-23044-2>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.12.085>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119679>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.102848>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.103091>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2023.103547>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2023.03.017>

3. How did the authors derive the empirical model? There should be a thorough theoretical underpinning behind the model. This section should be based on the authors' logic, and no citation/reference should appear here. The empirical model will follow this section.

4. Authors have merely reported the results without even discussing the economic intuitions behind the results. Are these results supporting or refuting the existing policies in the chosen context? Are the results directed toward any new policy initiatives? The discussion of results should open up the threads of policy discussion, which is entirely absent in this case. A mere comparison of the results with the literature doesn't ensure the novelty of the results unless they give out something new on the theory/policy front.
5. The conclusion reiterates the results, which is entirely undesirable. The authors should summarize the results within a maximum of 3 sentences. Moreover, the policies are completely vague, and it seems that the authors already had them in mind before starting the paper. The policies should be directly derived from the discussion of the results and should not go beyond the results.
6. The language used in the paper is way below the publishable level.