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

Francisco J. Caro-González[1]

1 Universidad de Sevilla

The proposed paper is interesting; however, from a scientific point of view, it has certain shortcomings. The introduction could benefit from a brief description of the structure of the paper, outlining how the evaluation of EdChat's will unfold in the subsequent sections. This would provide readers with a clear guide to what to expect.

Methodology:

In the platform analysis section, incorporating additional details on the methodology used to evaluate the features, user interface and content would improve clarity. Were specific analysis sheets used? What metrics were employed? It would be valuable to briefly explain why ChatGPT was chosen and how it was expected to contribute to the research objectives.

In addition, it would be relevant to know whether the three components of the methodology were implemented sequentially or simultaneously. An explanation of how the combination of literature review, platform analysis and artificial intelligence consultation enhances the validity and reliability of the findings would further enrich the work. While overall the methodology is sound, these recommendations are intended to make it more transparent and understandable to readers.

Results:

There is a lack of a clear connection between the methodology and the presentation of the results. Without this aspect, the document looks more like a well-prepared and well-supported sales document with bibliographical references. I suggest that the author more clearly establishes the relationship between the evidence obtained and the results.

Nevertheless, the article presents a compelling tool that deserves to be further explored by independent researchers. Such exploration should facilitate comparative studies with similar tools. As the author rightly suggests, studies on the reception of the products generated are crucial.

In short, while the work is interesting, filling these scientific and methodological gaps would greatly enhance its rigour and overall contribution to academic discourse.