

Review of: "The Key to Academic Equity: A Detailed Review of EdChat's Strategies"

Adil Youssef Sayeh¹

¹ Université Chouaib Doukkali

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article explores the transformative potential of the Educational Chat Network (EdChat) as a solution to the shortcomings of traditional academic publishing. It begins by addressing issues such as high subscription costs and limited accessibility in the existing model, positioning EdChat as an innovative platform that converts dense academic papers into shorter, more accessible articles. Employing a multi-method approach, including a literature review, platform analysis, and AI consultation, the article evaluates EdChat's features and contributions. It discusses the platform's role in providing accessible, time-efficient content, broadening audience reach, and fostering international collaboration. Technological, product, and industrial innovations of EdChat are examined, emphasizing its user-friendly interface, open reviews, mobile responsiveness, curated content, multimedia integration, and interactivity. The article acknowledges potential criticisms and limitations, suggesting future research directions to explore the real-world impact of EdChat and the effectiveness of short-form academic content, presenting an analysis of EdChat's potential in transforming academic publishing.

The article has some limitations. It briefly mentions potential challenges, such as the dilution of academic depth and concerns about peer review in a condensed format, without delving into a more in-depth exploration of these issues. Improved clarity in explaining figures, particularly Figure 1, and a more detailed discussion on how multimedia elements enhance user experience could enhance the article.

Also, the abstract is too short and needs to include how the data was selected and analyzed and the results and implications of the study are missing. In the introduction, the research objectives and questions are missing, and the methods section lacks explanations of how the data were processed and analyzed. Also, implications of findings for future research and practice are lacking.