Qeios

Peer Review

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

Asrul Anuar Zulkifli[1]

1. Ministry of Health Malaysia, Putrajaya, Malaysia

One important methodological concern is that the search query appears too restrictive, as it mainly uses the term “artificial intelligence” without clearly incorporating common synonyms, abbreviations, or closely related terms such as “AI,” “machine learning,” “generative AI,” “large language models,” or “intelligent systems,” which are frequently used in this field; this may have led to the omission of relevant studies and, consequently, may have influenced the completeness of the dataset as well as the validity of the publication trends, thematic mapping, and collaboration patterns reported in the study. Since bibliometric findings are highly dependent on the search strategy, the authors are encouraged to justify the keyword selection more clearly and to consider expanding the query to include broader alternative terms in order to improve retrieval sensitivity and provide a more comprehensive representation of the literature.

To make the search strategy more comprehensive, the authors should consider adding common synonyms, abbreviations, and closely related terms for artificial intelligence, such as “AI,” “machine learning,” “deep learning,” “generative AI,” “large language model*,” “LLM*,” “intelligent system*,” “intelligent tutor*,” “adaptive learning system*,” and possibly “automated decision-making” where relevant to educational technology and policy contexts, because the current query in the Methods section appears centered on “artificial intelligence” as the core AI descriptor.

If these terms are not included, the search may miss a substantial portion of relevant literature that discusses AI ethics in education using alternative terminology, which could lead to an incomplete dataset and affect the accuracy of the reported publication volume, thematic clusters, collaboration networks,

doi.org/10.32388/ZXM57W

and identified research gaps; consequently, the study's conclusions and recommendations may reflect only part of the actual knowledge landscape rather than the field as a whole.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.