

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
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

Compulsory 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.	The manuscript under review critically explores the integration of ChatGPT with critical pedagogy within educational systems. It underscores the potential benefits and challenges of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, fostering significant discussions on its ethical use and pedagogical impacts. However, the manuscript does not effectively outline these aspects, potentially limiting its contribution to the field. To enhance its theoretical assertions, the manuscript would benefit substantially from additional empirical evidence.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title requires further refinement and a more focused approach.	
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.	The article's abstract lacks a concise overview and could benefit from a sharper focus on the key findings. Unfortunately, it does not strictly adhere to the formal research instruction steps required for abstracts.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript does not adequately demonstrate scientific robustness or technical soundness due to its incomplete literature review and limited discussion of both the capabilities and limitations of ChatGPT in educational settings. It fails to fully capture the current state of AI technology within the context of critical pedagogy, with insufficient citation of recent and relevant studies, thus diminishing the credibility and depth of the analysis. The authors do not sufficiently engage with the potential and pitfalls of AI, resulting in a skewed view that does not fully acknowledge the complexities of technology integration in education.	
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	The manuscript explores ChatGPT within critical pedagogy but its effectiveness is hampered by significant omissions. The authors fail to specify their research approach and provide no analytical data, which are crucial for underpinning their conclusions. Additionally, the absence of a conflict of interest statement raises concerns about transparency and adherence to ethical academic practices.	

Review Form 3

<p>sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Methodological Clarity: The absence of a clearly defined research methodology makes it difficult to evaluate the robustness of the findings. • No Analytical Data: The lack of empirical data or analysis significantly undermines the manuscript's credibility and the ability to substantiate its claims. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The manuscript's references are not current enough, impacting its credibility negatively. It lacks a comprehensive selection of studies up to 2023, which could significantly enhance its relevance. Incorporating additional empirical research on ChatGPT's influence in educational contexts, along with insights from psychology or sociology, is necessary. Such additions would provide a fuller understanding of AI's educational impact, integrating essential data and diverse perspectives to deepen the analysis.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript explores ChatGPT within critical pedagogy, but its effectiveness is hampered by significant omissions. The authors fail to specify their research approach and provide no analytical data, which are crucial for underpinning their conclusions. Additionally, the absence of a conflict-of-interest statement raises concerns about transparency and adherence to ethical academic practices.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Methodological Clarity: The absence of a clearly defined research methodology makes it difficult to evaluate the robustness of the findings. • No Analytical Data: The lack of empirical data or analysis significantly undermines the manuscript's credibility and the ability to substantiate its claims. • Ethical Transparency: The manuscript does not include a conflict-of-interest statement, which is essential for maintaining transparency and trust in the findings. • Overlapping Content: The text repetitively discusses ChatGPT's implications in critical pedagogy without adding new insights, necessitating a more concise synthesis. • Depth of Analysis: More detailed exploration of specific cases where ChatGPT has been used in educational settings is needed to demonstrate its real-world impact effectively. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Saif Alneyadi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Alain University, UAE</p>