

Peer Review

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

Hassan Abuhassna¹

1. Sunway University, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia

This paper is ambitious and timely, providing a bibliometric analysis of ethical AI in education and policy using 342 Scopus-indexed articles. It identifies major ethical themes (privacy, fairness, integrity) and research gaps, while mapping collaboration networks. Although the study is valuable, the manuscript still has areas that need refinement to strengthen its clarity, rigor, and global contribution.

Abstract – The abstract is descriptive but lacks a sharp focus. It should better highlight the research problem, novelty, and significance for policy and educational technology. Currently, it reads like a section-by-section summary rather than a clear entry point for readers.

Introduction – The introduction establishes the relevance of AI ethics but is too general. The research gap is buried among statistics. It should clearly state: (1) that bibliometric reviews in AI ethics and education remain scarce, (2) that most existing studies neglect governance and policy dimensions, and (3) that this paper offers a systematic mapping of ethical issues and blind spots.

Literature Review – The review covers global policies and guidelines but remains largely descriptive. It lists organizations (e.g., Ada Lovelace Institute, AI Now) and frameworks but does not critically analyze their limitations. This section would benefit from tighter synthesis and stronger integration of recent scholarship on AI in education that emphasizes personalization, leadership, and policy dimensions (Al Nabhani, Hamzah, & Abuhassna, 2025; Alsubeia, Yusof, & Murshed, 2026; Li, Yusof, Abuhassna, & Pan, 2026).

Methodology – The search strategy is reported clearly (Scopus, 342 articles, VOSviewer), but the description is formulaic. Provide more justification for the database choice (why exclude Web of Science,

ERIC, or grey literature?). Explain quality controls (how were irrelevant articles filtered?) and clarify how keyword clusters were validated. Consider adding an appendix with the full search string and inclusion/exclusion criteria.

Results – The findings are presented with good visualizations (clusters, networks, co-occurrence maps). However, the interpretation is thin. The authors should explain *why* themes such as privacy and fairness dominate, while blockchain and child-centered ethics remain underexplored. Similarly, the collaboration analysis highlights asymmetry (USA/UK/China dominance), but the implications for global South contexts are not fully unpacked.

Discussion – The discussion is informative but leans toward description. It should provide more critical engagement: Why is research fragmented across disciplines? How do regional imbalances affect policy frameworks? What are the risks of letting the Global North dominate ethical discourse? The paper should also engage with the possibility that bibliometric data may exaggerate “trending” topics while overlooking practice-based insights.

Limitations – The limitations section is too short. It should explicitly acknowledge: (1) English-language bias, (2) exclusion of conference papers/book chapters, (3) dependence on one database (Scopus), and (4) the risk of equating the frequency of keywords with actual significance in practice.

Conclusion – The conclusion repeats the main results. It should instead emphasize forward-looking recommendations: (1) Encourage interdisciplinary policy research, (2) integrate children’s rights and marginalized voices into AI ethics debates, and (3) support South–South collaborations in education technology research.

Figures/Tables – The VOSviewer maps are informative but visually dense. Simplify cluster explanations and provide a stronger narrative linking each map to the research questions.

Language and Style – The writing is clear but overly formal. It sometimes reads like a project report rather than an academic article. The style should be tightened, with less redundancy and more emphasis on conceptual insights.

References – The references are extensive, but the paper would benefit from including more contemporary works on AI’s pedagogical, ethical, and leadership dimensions. Suggested additions:

In sum: This is a strong and relevant bibliometric study with clear value for AI ethics in education policy. To elevate it further, the authors should sharpen the research gap, expand methodological transparency,

deepen interpretation of results, broaden the limitations, and integrate more contemporary and policy-oriented literature.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.