

Review of: "Education, Artificial Intelligence, and the Digital Age"

Anastasia Kitsantas¹

¹ George Mason University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this manuscript, the authors examined various educational models and the factors related to the ability of these models to adapt and change to incorporate artificial intelligence (AI). By means of an extensive literature review and data collected from an online research forum, the authors were able to determine a series of factors that contributed to AI within educational models, as well as models that would be deemed appropriate within this digital age. Although an interesting concept, the organization and inconsistencies regarding the research goals made the manuscript somewhat difficult to follow and determine which contexts they centered their research in. For example, at one point, they discuss their topic within higher education, yet later in the manuscript, they refer to K-12, and even tutoring. It is essential that the authors determine their context and then present literature that is related to the population of interest. Further, this should also be mentioned within the abstract and earlier in the manuscript.

Additionally, when the authors do present the different models, it is done so in a listed manner. It is recommended that the authors streamline this section and show a connecting thread as to why these models were highlighted in the text. Furthermore, if the authors are focused within higher education, it is important that the models are discussed within that context.

Regarding the research methodological approach, the authors have not presented a solidified research question or aim; instead, various methods were presented without any lead-in. For example, from the beginning of the manuscript, it seemed as if the authors were looking into factors of various models and the AI components by conducting a systematic review, whereas later it is mentioned that the authors collected data from an online forum which was thematically analyzed. Although it is important to note that the line on page 2 ("...which are the determining factors...context of our research topic") was a clear and concise statement that the authors should consider as the basis for their research purpose and/or aim.

Further points within the methodology to consider: a) there is mention of validity regarding the data collected from the forums – this section of the study is qualitative in nature, thus the goal for the authors would be to provide evidence for trustworthiness rather than validity; b) it is unclear whether the factors listed were themes that emerged from the thematic analysis or just implications; and c) it is important to mention how consent was obtained for the online forum – do these participants know they are being quoted and their responses analyzed?

Other related points include – a) the need for citations (e.g., when the authors make statements where they claim certain

knowledge as 'obvious' – obvious to whom?), otherwise these would be assumptions; b) the use of the word specialized to describe the literature is vague – should be more concise and related to purpose/aim of research; c) the manuscript in general needs to be read for grammar and run-on sentences; and d) these listed models in the results/discussion should be described in the introduction/literature review. In the discussion, the author may refer to these models in connection to their findings.

Overall, the conclusion of the manuscript is well written and nicely brings together the study; however, there is a disconnect throughout and a lack of clarity regarding a purpose/aim, making the manuscript challenging to follow. I encourage the authors to continue working on this line of research.