

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 paper focuses solely on ChatGPT, while there are many chatbot arenas with hundreds of large language models: the most famous would-be Gemini and Claude, Microsoft Copilot to consider. The topic is relevant as this is a problem for all educators, and to some degree, it questions the necessity of their own positions. The authors focus solely on essays while ChatGPT writes code, solves maths, and can assist in almost any task. This study would be more focused if it described a precise subject of study or student cohort.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suggested not to focus on a particular tool or product and take it broadly to a broader scope of AI. The name of the tools can also change, or companies may reorganize; for example, Bard from Google was transformed into Gemini, Bing from Microsoft into Copilot, etc.	
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.	It is of a good size, but the abstract should state what authors developed, implemented and proposed, not just to understand	
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.	The manuscript lacks methodology and a unique approach taken by the authors. It lacks artifacts (formulas, Tables, graphs, screenshots, etc.). For example, authors could represent a transformed pedagogy landscape. It is true that AI is everywhere and will eventually be on any device, and it can talk or potentially interact with users in other ways naturally. The article lacks the latest technology for the moment. For example, some users already have access to the advanced speech mode of ChatGPT; there is ChatGPT – o1 latest model that is 'even smarter,' there is AI Search, etc.	

Review Form 3

	The issue is also that some students would use it, some not; some do not know how, and this disbalance disadvantages some. It is also unclear why the focus is on American education and why worldwide expertise is not overviewed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I would add more references from 2024.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Can be adjusted but understandable.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yulia Kumar
Department, University & Country	Kean University, USA