

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_119977
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining the Role of Generative AI in Academic Integrity and Learning Outcomes: A Case Study of Selected Universities in the Upper East Region
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 1.7

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<b>1.</b> This research paper examines how generative AI affects academic integrity and student learning in universities. Understanding impact of AI in general, Generative AI in particular, on education is very crucial. It offers valuable data for shaping policies and practices in higher education as AI becomes more prominent. <b>2.</b> While the original title is clear, "Impact of Generative AI on Academic Integrity and Learning Outcomes: A Case Study in the Upper East Region" is a strong alternative. It's more concise and still conveys the key elements of the research. <b>3.</b> The abstract effectively condenses the research by outlining the study's objectives, methodology, and principal findings. It cogently emphasizes the growing role of generative AI in education, the associated concerns with academic integrity, and the potential impact on student learning outcomes. This concise overview serves to effectively orient the reader. <b>4.</b> The manuscript demonstrates a well-structured organization. Clear divisions for introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and discussion ensure a logical flow of information. This facilitates a coherent narrative for the reader, making it easy to follow the research journey. <b>5.</b> The well-structured manuscript employs a mixed-methods design and thorough analysis to ensure scientifically sound. The recommendation presented as part of the conclusion if justified with the findings will be more appropriate. <b>6.</b> The reference list provides a solid foundation with recent studies on generative AI in education. To enhance the review's scope, consider incorporating additional sources that explore the ethical considerations surrounding AI's use in education and discuss the latest advancements in AI technology. This could enrich the literature review and offer a more comprehensive understanding of the evolving landscape.	<b>1.</b> Thank you for recognizing the importance of our study. We believe our research will contribute valuable insights into the evolving role of generative AI in education. <b>2.</b> We appreciate the suggestion for the alternative title. We agree that it is more concise and clearly conveys the focus of our research. We have updated the title accordingly. <b>3.</b> Thank you for your positive feedback on the abstract. We are glad that it effectively communicates the key aspects of our study. <b>4.</b> We appreciate your acknowledgment of the manuscript's structure. Ensuring a logical flow of information was a key focus during the writing process. <b>5.</b> Thank you for your feedback on our methodology and analysis. We will ensure that our recommendations in the conclusion are clearly justified with our findings. <b>6.</b> We agree with your suggestion to incorporate additional sources on ethical considerations and the latest advancements in AI technology. We have added these references to the literature review, which are highlighted in the manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and concise language. There are minor grammatical errors and typographical issues that should be corrected to enhance readability and professionalism. A thorough proofreading would be beneficial.	Thank you for your positive feedback on the language quality of the manuscript. We will conduct a thorough proofreading to correct any minor grammatical errors and typographical issues to enhance readability and professionalism.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	While the mixed methods approach effectively captures the contemporary landscape, a stronger justification for the recommendations could be provided by integrating the research findings with relevant literature and the authors' own expertise. This enriched discussion would not only strengthen the paper but also serve as a valuable case study for policymakers and academic institutions grappling with AI policy development.	We agree that integrating our findings with relevant literature and our own expertise will provide a stronger justification for our recommendations. We will enrich our discussion section accordingly, highlighting how our research findings align with existing literature and leveraging our expertise to propose well-founded recommendations. This should offer greater value for policymakers and academic institutions.

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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