

Review of: "Cultural and Regional Influences on Global AI Apprehension"

Mary Carman¹

¹ University of Witwatersrand, South Africa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper presents the findings of a qualitative literature review examining cultural and regional influences on the apprehension of AI, finding that there are 'significant regional differences in AI governance based on unique socio-economic conditions, political structures, and cultural values' (abstract). This is a valuable piece of work, and there are insightful discussions of what seem to be substantive regional differences.

It is let down, however, by the reporting of the study. There is no mention of, for instance, how many papers were surveyed in total or for each region. Without information like this, it is hard to know whether the qualitative insights are drawn from one, two, or many papers discussing AI apprehension in a region. This is directly relevant for drawing substantive conclusions about 'regional' views: are they genuinely regional, or the views of a handful of authors who may or may not represent the views common in a region? Similarly, what types of sources are drawn on: are they empirical studies, theoretical discussions, government documents, etc.? I suspect this is a reporting issue and not a problem with the study per se, and so could be easily addressed. For instance, the author could use something like a PRISMA flow diagram to depict the selection and inclusion process, or a table with a breakdown of regions, number, and types of sources. (And possibly add a column in Table 1 to give examples of representative sources for the findings described in each row.) I realise that this is not intended as a systematic literature review; nevertheless, a secondary literature is being drawn upon to make substantive conclusions, and to this extent, it is similar. Providing more information about the number and types of sources reviewed would strengthen the support for the conclusions drawn.

I found section 3, 'Current and common apprehensions,' a bit confusing in the context of the study's aims. If these are established current and common apprehensions, then why do we need the current paper, whose aim is 'to explore cultural, regional, and socio-political differences in AI apprehension'? Is the research going to provide further support for the differences already laid out in section 3? However, I question whether sufficient evidence has been given in Section 3 to make the strong claims in the first place (without drawing on the study's own findings, but we haven't got there yet!), where references tend to be to theoretical pieces or commentaries and not to primary research into the apprehensions. Overall, then, I think the introductory sections, and in particular section 3, could either be phrased with more qualification – e.g., there seem to be these apprehensions, which this research is going to examine in more depth – or more support to back up the empirical claims being made should be given, and the precise aims of the current study then clarified.

Other comments:

Reference 1 gives incomplete authors: Jobin, Ienca AND Vayena.

Methodology: To clarify. 'Relevance to Regional Perspectives: Only studies addressing regional or cultural differences in AI perceptions, governance, or ethical concerns were included.' Here, the focus is limited to those articles that address differences. (Vs. under 'Peer-Reviewed Articles', these are ones that 'discussed AI apprehension, AI governance...' more generally.) Is that correct? But why this limited focus: Couldn't a lot of relevant analysis be drawn from studies that focused on AI perceptions, governance, or ethical concerns within a region, but that do not themselves address regional or cultural *differences*?

I gather from the limitations that English-language sources were included. This should be noted in the inclusion criteria.

Section 6: Findings. Why are South Africa, Kenya, Brazil, and Argentina chosen as key focuses? Some explanation is needed. Much commentary has been made about the Middle East and Asia: why not include one of these countries?

Section 7: Cultural Factors Shaping AI Apprehension. 'The level of public trust in technology and institutions significantly influences the approach to AI governance in different countries, as depicted in Table 1.' Table 1 doesn't depict this. This would need some further evidence of levels of public trust in different countries, e.g., OECD surveys, which may or may not group nicely into regions.

These questions aside, I do want to emphasise that this is valuable work, and the discussion contains many relevant and important insights. Addressing my comments about reporting would, I hope, strengthen the contribution that is already there.