

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_127376
Title of the Manuscript:	The Intersection of ChatGPT and Critical Pedagogy in American Education Systems: should there be a reason to get worried?
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	1. Background: I think the use of AI nowadays is intent or experiment only rather than "fully embedded". 2. The overview of Critical Pedagogy is mainly copied from Wikipedia, but not mentioned anywhere. Without referring it is a plaque. It would be worthwhile to revise the whole paper and make the proper references.	

**Review Form 3**

	<p><b>3. This paper is mainly a study of others' opinions and lack of initiative. A concrete case study would help.</b></p> <p>4. This paper is mainly a study of others' opinions and lack of initiative. A concrete case study would help.</p> <p>5. This manuscript requires an overview and mend the all the above-mentioned points. Publishing only after that.</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>-</p>	<p><b>yes</b></p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>There are some language failures, even in the Abstract. I propose to use Grammarly - even the free version - to mend.</b></p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript requires overview and mending.</p>	

**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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Peter G. Gyarmati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Stanford University, Hungary</b>