

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is important and timely to address the excessive usage of AI in academia. Such research is essential to highlighting both the benefits and potential drawbacks of AI's role in educational settings. The title of the manuscript is suitable for the content it presents. The abstract would benefit from including the significance or implications of the research findings. This addition would provide a clearer understanding of the study's impact and relevance. The structure of the manuscript is correct, but the way of narration is a bit digressive, which loses the logical flow. The limitations and Implications of the study can be relocated. I suggest placing them under the Conclusion subsection. Furthermore, the conclusion is the most important part as it covers the final decision about the research findings. The author just paraphrased some lines that s/he referred to in the introduction. Though the conclusion is a revisit of the introduction, the author should mention some key points of findings and how they will contribute to the academic literature. In the method section, the author mentioned an open-ended survey for interviews. The word survey may cause confusion for the readers. It might be open-ended questions, not surveys. The research lacks specific research questions. As a result, the findings do not strongly connect to how AI usage affects academic integrity and enhances learning outcomes, which are the main focuses of the research. The findings section does not adequately address these key areas. The discussion section seems to overlook the primary aim of the research. Although the author attempts to provide a comprehensive overview of AI in academia, it is crucial that the research questions, findings, and discussion are interwoven to ensure the research is scientific and valid. The author should revisit these sections to ensure they align more closely with the research aims. The references are recent (within the last five years) and highly relevant. There are many valuable articles available in Springer Nature that the author could utilize if needed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No changes needed as the current manuscript already focuses on this issue. We appreciate the feedback and are pleased that the title aligns well with the content of the manuscript. Thank you for your suggestion. We have added a sentence to the abstract to highlight the significance and implications of our research findings. The "Limitations" and "Implications" sections have been relocated to the "Conclusion" subsection. The "Conclusion" section has been revised to include key findings and their contribution to academic literature. The term "open-ended survey" in the methodology section has been corrected to "open-ended questions." We acknowledge the need for clearer research questions and better alignment of findings and discussion with the research aims. Thank you for the positive feedback on the references. We will consider incorporating additional relevant articles from Springer Nature to strengthen the literature review.
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The overall language communication quality is acceptable but requires some corrections. Specifically, there are inconsistencies in tense usage, particularly in the method section, that need to be addressed. 	<p>We have revised the manuscript to ensure consistent tense usage throughout, particularly in the method section.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The sentences in the implication section sound like findings, not implications! Kindly rewrite. Statements are more generalized, though the author should have been more specific by providing examples while narrating the pros and cons of AI. Most of the sentences are just descriptive. It would be better if the presentation was analytical, like the Socratic approach. Adding the DOI number of each reference could be better.</p>	<p>We have rewritten the implication section to be more analytical and specific, using examples to highlight the pros and cons of AI in academia. Additionally, we have adopted a more Socratic approach to stimulate critical thinking and analysis.</p>

Review Form 1.7

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	