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

Eimantas Peičius[1]

1 Professor at the Department of Bioethics, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript is considered to contribute to the "rising tide" of sociological, ethical, and other kinds of reflections on AI implications for social reality in general. In particular, the author is "addressing [..] gaps for developing inclusive AI governance frameworks that acknowledge regional differences," meaning cultural and regional context. There is no doubt that context, or what is called 'cultural and regional' implications, does really matter for AI applications and apprehensions in general. The intention to see how cultural background, including gender, ethnic, ideological, worldview, and any other kind of identity, can affect approaches and attitudes towards AI in health care, education, socio-political life, etc., is more than appreciated and puts some value on the topic's relevance. The structure of the manuscript corresponds to formal requirements and exceeds in terms of extent, especially in the "Findings" part.

However, there are some major issues with this manuscript. Firstly, some terms employed in the manuscript are quite vague and not explicitly defined. It is not particularly clear what the author means by 'regional' and how it differs from or is associated with 'cultural,' because sometimes it is defined as 'Western' and 'non-Western' [values, beliefs, etc.], while later it is differentiated by presenting the Middle East, China, Asia, and Latin America. 'Regional' seems to be a weak and not convincing concept in the discussion overall.   It is not clear on what ground such a regional definition is made and whether regional differences are necessarily equal to cultural ones. The term "artificial intelligence" should also be explained, and even using it in a very general meaning, it is under question what is meant by that - a phenomenon, software, IT tool, or something else. I think the main object of deliberations should leave no questions – what we are talking about.

Secondly, the manuscript contains few dominant ideas about the importance of different perspectives and taking into account cultural (and/or regional) specifics, which are repeating more or less in different phrases in the Introduction, Why it Matters, Findings, and Conclusions parts in rather a declarative way without any facts, statements, or evidence of why it is so much important. In the Methodology part, the author claims to use a qualitative research approach "focusing on a comprehensive literature review." But then, in the "Study Limitations and Future Research Directions" part, the author confirms that it is neither one nor the other. The author just represents and comments on some other researchers' findings. The manuscript also could be much more consistent: the conceptual framework presented in Figure 1 is not well argued and explained, and in the following text, instead of cultural norms, cultural factors are discussed, and political governance and economic context seem to be changed by colonial legacies, employment issues, etc. On the other hand, the manuscript entails some worthwhile insights on AI misconceptions in certain communities, reasons for the lack of

public trust in AI and other innovative technologies, AI's implications for poverty management, and other issues that are sometimes set aside in the debates over AI. Overall, the manuscript should undergo major corrections, including redefining the concepts, redesigning the methods, and reframing the structure of the presented ideas and focusing on some particular scientific approach (for instance, epistemic or based on some sociological theory), also reviewing the newest literature on the topic. The author is right - much future research is awaiting, but then some benchmarks for future research should be outlined in a strict scientific and reasonable way.