

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124702
Title of the Manuscript:	Mapping the AI Revolution: A Global Bibliometric Analysis of Research Trends from 2019 to 2024
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>The manuscript offers a comprehensive analysis of AI research trends from 2019 to 2024, a critical period of rapid growth in AI. It uses a comprehensive bibliometric approach, sourcing data from Scopus and analyzing publication volume, citations, and keyword trends. The large dataset of 3,149 documents provides a credible overview of global AI research activities. The paper highlights the critical role of international collaboration, particularly between China, the USA, and Europe, in advancing AI research, providing valuable insights into the geographical dynamics of AI innovation. The paper also includes ethical considerations, emphasizing the increasing importance of ethical AI and fairness in machine learning, reflecting current discourse on responsible AI development. This depth in the analysis acknowledges both technical advancements and societal impacts.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p><u>Areas for Improvement:</u></p> <p>The introduction of the paper could be improved by separating technological advancements from societal implications of AI. The methodology could be more explicit about keyword selection, addressing potential skepticism. The analysis of key research trends, such as machine learning, deep learning, and neural networks, could be expanded on, such as the growth of big data, computational power, and applications in autonomous systems. Emerging topics like ethical AI and systematic approaches could be explored, with real-world examples or case studies added. Data visualization could be more clearly integrated into the narrative, and the limitations section could be expanded to include non-English publications and AI research from smaller, less-developed countries. The manuscript suggests expanding future bibliometric analysis to other databases and recommending specific emerging AI fields for future research.</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><u>Minor Issues:</u></p> <p>.1 Referencing Style:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some references appear inconsistent in format (e.g., spacing, periods in journal titles). Ensure consistency across the references section according to the chosen style guide. <p>.2 Technical Terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In some areas, technical jargon is used without sufficient explanation for a general audience (e.g., "Generative Adversarial Networks" or "Transformers in NLP"). Including brief explanations or examples of these terms could help readers outside the core AI domain. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</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><u>Conclusion and Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into global AI research trends and successfully identifies core and emerging topics. However, there is room for improvement in the clarity of the narrative, depth of analysis, and integration of visuals. The limitations section could be expanded for transparency, and the methodology should be further explained to ensure robustness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Doreyed Muhammed Ahmed Al-Kerboly
Department, University & Country	University Of Anbar, Iraq