

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJL2C_123273</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Persuasive Language and Critical Literacy as Means of Ensuring Students' Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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>This manuscript is vital for the scientific community as it tackles the increasing issue of AI misuse in education, a matter with far-reaching consequences for academic integrity and the future of learning. By examining the risks and suggesting solutions, it adds valuable insights to the ongoing discussion on responsible AI use in education. Additionally, it sets the stage for future research and policy development, highlighting the importance of proactive efforts to ensure AI supports, rather than disrupts, educational progress.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the article is clear and informative, effectively reflecting the core focus of the study. It highlights both the key concepts (persuasive language and critical literacy) and the main application area (ethical use of AI by students)</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>The abstract effectively summarizes the study's objectives, emphasizing the importance of these language-based techniques to mitigate unethical AI practices in education.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The introduction provides a solid foundation, linking the ethical concerns of AI with the potential solutions offered by effective language use. The literature review, methodology, and analysis are all well-structured, offering insights into how persuasive communication and critical literacy can be utilized to address the misuse of AI in academia.</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>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it demonstrates a well-structured research design that aligns with the study's objectives. Overall, the paper is thorough and offers a unique perspective on addressing ethical concerns in AI through language-based strategies. It contributes significantly to the ongoing conversation about AI in education and provides a strong foundation for further research and policy development.</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>The references in this manuscript appear to be sufficient and cover a broad range of relevant literature, providing a strong foundation for the study. The citations include both foundational works and more recent studies, ensuring the manuscript is up-to-date with current research trends</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript demonstrates clear and concise expression, appropriate academic tone, and correct grammar and syntax. The technical terminology is well-used, and the ideas are communicated effectively.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>the methodology and theoretical discussions are detailed but could be streamlined for better readability.</p> <p>While the theoretical framework is solid, incorporating specific examples of persuasive language or critical literacy techniques in action would enhance the practical applicability of the study.</p> <p>Although the study emphasizes language-based techniques, a more explicit connection to AI ethics could strengthen the argument. Including a section on AI ethics frameworks (e.g., fairness, transparency) and how they intersect with persuasive language and critical literacy might provide a deeper understanding.</p> <p>The conclusion could reiterate the practical steps and recommendations for stakeholders, emphasizing the urgency of adopting these language-based approaches in the face of rapidly advancing AI technologies.</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>Ajay Kumar Attri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Himachal Pradesh University, India</b>