

Peer Review

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

Xia Zhang¹

1. Xinyang College of Agriculture and Forestry, Xinyang, China

The manuscript reports a Scopus-based bibliometric analysis (VOSviewer + Excel) of 342 peer-reviewed articles (2020–2025) on AI ethics in educational technology and policy. It maps keyword clusters, country networks, and themes, and also argues for more policy-oriented, interdisciplinary research and attention to blind spots. The manuscript focusing on ethics/governance in AI fills a real gap beyond purely technical surveys. The research questions are well put so that they solicit answers to the objectives of the research. The methodology and analysis utilized were resourceful and well explained. However, there are major issues that need to be addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript, which are as follows:

1. Inconsistency in time frame and study selection clarity

In Table 1, the author lists the time span as 2015–2025, while the gap statement, Methods, and Analysis sections repeatedly state 2020–2025. The author has to verify the time frame properly and also explain why 2015–2019 items were excluded, if they were, and how the query was actually executed. Also, is there any specific reason for the selection of whichever time frame? Or was it just done randomly?

You note 825 initial records and 342 analyzed, but the author did not mention the document screening/deduplication, inclusion/exclusion at each step, or reasons for exclusion. Add a PRISMA-style flow diagram and a supplementary list of included records.

2. Internal contradiction about the role of the United States

The abstract says output and collaboration are led by the United States, UK, and China; later, the Discussion claims the United States appeared minimally engaged. These conflict and undermine trust in the network interpretation.

3. Query design & reproducibility

The search string focuses on ethic + policy + educational tech; however, ethics is often framed as “governance”, “responsibility”, “accountability”, “transparency”, “fairness” without the word “ethic*”. Consider adding these synonyms to the TITLE-ABS-KEY field to reduce false negatives; report exact final queries per field, run date (already given, May 2025), and filters (doc types, subject areas), matching selection and time span consistently.

4. The study reporting is missing essential figures and tables for top countries, institutions, authors, and journals with their citation counts and h-index to make the study more comprehensive.

5. Limitations are underdeveloped: You note English-only and single-database limitations; also acknowledge index coverage bias (Scopus vs. WoS/ERIC/IEEE), field misclassification, self-citation effects, policy documents not indexed, and fast-moving preprint literature. Consider a small triangulation (e.g., WoS cross-check) or explicitly justify Scopus-only.

6. Language & style: There are multiple tense/grammar/typo issues; here are examples with suggested fixes:

“The The General Data Protection Regulation” → “The General Data Protection Regulation.”

“it certainly does not had data” → “it certainly does not have data” / “did not include data”.

“disrutping education” → “disrupting education” (Discussion).

“focuseed” → “focused”; “context-dependant” → “context-dependent”.

Prefer active voice and consistent past tense in Methods/Results.

7. References (accuracy & quality control)

Mixed or questionable metadata (e.g., a journal citation paired with an arXiv DOI): “Young (2024) ... Int J Innov Res Dev ... doi:10.48550/arXiv.2406.18900” — verify venue and use either the journal DOI or the arXiv DOI, not both; ensure consistency with journal style.

Remove duplicated DOIs/links in the reference block and check non-English or off-topic citations for relevance to AI ethics in education.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.