

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 <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>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>While the manuscript aims to provide a comprehensive bibliometric analysis of Artificial Intelligence (AI) research from 2019 to 2024, it suffers from significant issues that diminish its importance to the scientific community. The inclusion of data from the future year 2024, without a clear explanation of how this data was obtained or projected, raises serious concerns about the validity and reliability of the study. Additionally, the manuscript contains numerous repetitions and lacks clarity in its methodology and structure, which detracts from its overall contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "A Bibliometric Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Research from 2019 to 2024," is misleading because it suggests that the study includes data up to 2024, which is beyond the current year. As of now, data for 2024 would not be available.</p> <p>Modify the title to reflect the actual years of data analyzed. For example, "A Bibliometric Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Research from 2019 to 2023."</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>The abstract is generally comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's purpose, methodology, key findings, and implications. It effectively highlights the growth in AI research, identifies leading countries and institutions, and discusses both foundational and emerging themes in the field.</p> <p>Adjust the Time Frame: Since data for 2024 may not be available, consider revising the period to "2019 to 2023" to reflect the actual data analyzed.</p> <p>Include Methodological Details: Briefly mention the use of bibliometric analysis techniques to give readers insight into how the study was conducted.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>ok</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>The scientific robustness of the manuscript is compromised due to several critical issues:</p> <p>Inclusion of Future Data: Presenting data from 2024 without a clear explanation undermines the credibility of the analysis.</p> <p>Methodological Clarity: The methodology section lacks sufficient detail on how data were collected, especially concerning future projections.</p> <p>Over-reliance on a Single Database: Using only the Scopus database may result in a limited dataset and potential bias.</p> <p>Refrain from including unverifiable future data. Enhance the methodology section with detailed explanations of data collection, inclusion criteria, and analysis techniques. Consider incorporating data from additional reputable databases to strengthen the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>ok</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript has the potential to contribute valuable insights into AI research trends if the critical issues are addressed. Ensuring methodological rigor, accurate data representation, and clear communication are essential steps toward enhancing the manuscript's quality and impact.</p> <p>Misrepresentation of Data: Including data from the year 2024 without transparent methodology suggests potential fabrication or misrepresentation.</p> <p>Use of AI Tools: The disclaimer about using ChatGPT for keyword generation raises questions about the extent of AI assistance and whether appropriate attribution and critical evaluation were applied.</p>	

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:	Kevin Chamorro
Department, University & Country	School of Mathematical and Computational Sciences Yachay Tech, Ecuador