

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript clearly shows some important work on the impact of generative AI in higher education. Upon a cursory search, not a lot of such studies have been conducted in Ghana. Thus, it is impactful to have this study in the journal. The study seems to be the first of its kind and can be expanded upon by future research to delve deeper into critical issues regarding ethical use of AI etc. The title of the article seems appropriate. The abstract repeats the title of the paper in its first sentence. It is unnecessary to do so as the authors have explained it later in the abstract. The abstract can start as... 'with the growing prevalence...' The subsections and structure of the manuscript are almost alright. A few suggestions that may be required to raise the standard of the writing in the manuscript have been suggested here. The authors have sometimes used a future tense in the manuscript. I suggest they change it to past tense as the study has already been completed. The manuscript is scientifically correct to a degree. There are a few explanations at some points that need to be clarified/reworked. The references are recent enough. There is a good mix of old and recent references. Majority of them are from 2020 and beyond. This is acceptable. It would be good to look through the proceedings of Australasian Engineering Education Conference 2023 as there were quite a few talks on AI in the conference. The only problem I found was the lack of references and their comparison to current results. <p>These are some of the points I think the authors should work on to add more credibility to the document.</p> <p>The authors have used a format of writing as follows, '[28] highlight how generative AI...' is this the format that the journal normally accepts? I would suggest using the author name and then the reference number to make it more effective and easier to read than the format above. For example, the above statement could be started as, 'Sevnarayan and Potter [28] highlight how generative AI...'</p> <p>2. Related Works</p> <p>The authors have mentioned the 3E model in their related works section. Please explain in short what the model is.</p> <p>The authors talk about Structural Equation Modelling (SEM-PLS) and their significant improvements in student learning experiences. Can they provide an example from the cited source?</p> <p>I can understand why the authors chose to do a table of relevant findings. However, I would suggest that the authors write their table under a thematic classification rather than author-based classification of literature review. This would add a layer of complexity to their lit review and the authors can then critique these themes with their own insights and interpretations.</p> <p>If you decide to keep the tabular format, I recommend putting in reference numbers for each of the article and not just the author and year.</p> <p>3. Methodology</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> We appreciate the acknowledgment of the study's importance and its potential impact on the field, especially given the limited research on generative AI in Ghana. We appreciate the positive feedback on the title. We agree with your suggestion to revise the abstract to avoid repetition. We have reviewed and adjusted the tense throughout the manuscript to ensure consistency with past tense, reflecting the completed study. We have reviewed and clarified the explanations that needed reworking. Specific areas revised include the methodology and discussion sections to ensure clarity and coherence. We have added relevant references from the Australasian Engineering Education Conference 2023 and included a comparative analysis with our current results. <p>Thank you for your constructive feedback. We appreciate the detailed suggestions for improving the credibility of our manuscript. Below, we address each point raised by the reviewer and describe the changes we have made to enhance the document's quality and scientific rigor.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The use of case study approach has been repeated twice within 5 sentences. Please delete one of those.</p> <p>In 3.3, Cochran's formula has been mentioned but not referred. Both formulae mentioned here are just mentioned. Could you show your working/justify on how you reached the value of 150 students? Secondly, the authors mention using some data from the faculty. What about the number of faculty that was included in the dataset? Please mention this in the details as well.</p> <p>In 3.4, were the interviews structured/unstructured/semi-structured?</p> <p>The explanation for Pearson coefficient of correlation is unnecessary. You could just use a reference and delete all the explanation in 3.5.1.</p> <p>4. Results</p> <p>Unsure if it is important but, the text in 4 seems different. The demographic table shows gender distribution, age range, academic level and field of study. I am assuming this data was collected along with the forms. I would like to see a more detailed analysis of the figures in 4.4 with these parameters. How was the perception of AI in males and females, in different age groups, academic levels and field of study. It easily adds more sophistication to the manuscript.</p> <p>In 4.3.1, the authors mention concerns about potential biased outputs. Could you please give an example here? Either an activity or a quote where this was observed.</p> <p>In 4.3.3, a possible addressal of these concerns could be a design overhaul of the assessments. Perhaps the assessment design needs to change to incorporate AI.</p> <p>Figures 1 through 8 all have a problem with the scale in the Y-axis. I believe it is the raw number of students rather than percentage as mentioned on the numbers above the bars. Please correct these numbers.</p> <p>Please rewrite the paragraph in 4.4.1 that explains fig. 2.</p> <p>For the paragraph after fig.7, the numbers used are for CKT-UTAS. Please mention that explicitly in the text. Why is the limitations section inserted before 4.4? I would suggest you change its position to the end of the Results and discussion section and make it a separate section/sub-section.</p> <p>The discussion sorely lacks some references which can corroborate with the findings of this study. I understand these are their results and findings. However, the discussion should contain at least a few citations to sources that either showed similar or contrasting results to the ones obtained by the authors.</p> <p>The point of triangulation is excellent. Please check if there is some source that might agree with what you have said here.</p> <p>In recommendations, the point of balanced usage, do you have any suggestions for the faculty to monitor/ensure balanced usage?</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

<div>Minor REVISION comments</div> <div>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</div>	<div>The English in the article is pretty consistent and except for a rare typo, there are not many grammatical errors in the manuscript. However, I am suggesting some structural changes that may help improve the manuscript. The authors have every right to disregard any and all of these changes.</div> <div>In 1. Introduction, the authors state that generative AI can autonomously create content. How is this used in an educational context and why does it raise concerns in academic integrity and learning outcomes in higher education.</div> <div>In 3.4, What LOs were tested? Were they the Learning Outcomes of the whole degree or a particular course? I am assuming they were for a particular course. However, it seems too broad to evaluate as the LOs have not been expounded upon.</div> <div>For the paragraph explaining fig. 4, the authors mention, ‘these findings indicate significant hurdles, emphasizing the need for professional development, clear guidelines and further research to ensure effective and responsible integration of Generative AI in education.’ Please elaborate on the type of guidelines and policies outlined here. Are these policies for students? Are these for the faculty to improve their course design and limit the impact of AI?</div>	
<div>Optional/General comments</div>	<div>The discussion section of the paper is sorely under-referenced. Please include more references in the discussion section.</div>	

PART 2:

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