

**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	<b>Research Paper</b>

**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>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.</p>	<p>This paper presents a comprehensive study comparing the effectiveness of AI grading systems (specifically ChatGPT-3.5 and ChatGPT-4) with human graders in higher education. The research spans multiple academic programs and modules, using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Overall, this research provides valuable insights into the current capabilities and limitations of AI in educational assessment, contributing significantly to the ongoing discourse on AI integration in higher education.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b>            Comprehensive scope: The study covers a wide range of subjects and assessment types, providing a broad perspective on AI grading capabilities.            Methodological approach: The use of action research design allows for iterative improvements and real-world application.            Large sample size: The study includes a substantial number of scripts (over 3,500 in Study 2 alone), enhancing the reliability of the findings.            Comparative analysis: The research effectively compares different versions of AI (GPT-3.5 and GPT-4) with human graders, highlighting the evolution of AI capabilities.            Practical implications: The study offers insights into the potential integration of AI in educational assessment, considering both benefits and limitations.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b> Limited generalizability: The study is confined to a single higher education institution in South Africa, which may limit its applicability to other contexts. Potential bias in AI training: The paper does not thoroughly address how the AI models were trained or potential biases in their training data. Lack of detailed statistical analysis: While the paper presents numerical data, it lacks in-depth statistical analysis to support its conclusions.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> This paper is suitable for publication with minor optional revisions. The authors should consider: Including more detailed statistical analysis to strengthen their findings. Discussing the potential biases and limitations of AI training more thoroughly. Expanding on the implications of their findings for educational policy and practice.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Vinod Kumar Kanvaria</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Delhi, India</b>