

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_125085
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>AI Versus Human Graders: Assessing the Role of Large Language Models in Higher Education</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses the evolving role of AI in educational assessment, a field that is witnessing rapid technological integration. By offering a comprehensive comparison between AI and human grading, it provides valuable insights into how AI can be effectively utilized to enhance grading efficiency while maintaining assessment quality. The study's emphasis on a hybrid model, where AI and human graders work together, highlights a balanced approach that could transform educational assessment practices. There is a thorough analysis, combined with practical implications, which could guide future research and policy-making in the integration of AI in education. However, the reliance on structured memoranda for AI performance might be seen as a limitation, suggesting an area for further improvement in AI capabilities.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by employing a rigorous research methodology that combines both qualitative and quantitative analyses across multiple academic programs and modules. This comprehensive approach ensures that the findings are well-substantiated and representative of a broad educational context. The study's use of action research design allows for iterative testing and refinement of AI grading tools, enhancing the validity of the results. Additionally, the manuscript provides detailed statistical comparisons between AI and human grading, which are crucial for evaluating accuracy and consistency. The emphasis on ethical considerations, such as data anonymity and consent, further underscores the manuscript's adherence to scientific standards, making it a robust and technically sound contribution to the field.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>YES</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality of the article appears to be suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript mainly uses clear and precise language, which is essential for conveying complex ideas effectively in an academic setting. It employs appropriate terminology related to AI, education, and research methodologies, ensuring that the content is accessible to its intended scholarly audience. The manuscript is well-organized, with a logical flow of information that enhances readability and comprehension. However, there are minor mistakes considering clarity and correctness (punctuation and misspelled words) that need a professional intervention.	
Optional/General comments	-	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Marijana Drinovac Topalovic</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Applied Sciences "Marko Marulic" of Knin, Croatia</b>