Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development

Journal: Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development

Manuscript ID: # 7468

Title: Extent of Dependence of Jordanian Electronic News Websites on Artificial Intelligence Applications

Reviewer A

---

1. How do you rate the significance of the research (in a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the most significant)?

Rate 4

2. How do you rate the originality (in a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest)?

Rate 4

3. How do you rate the experimental design and quality of data (in a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest)?

This part requires better explanation and visualization to support the methodology and results.

4. Is the organization of the article appropriate?

Yes, but the actual research part is not well organized which interfere with understanding the methodology, the results and their significance.

5. Did you find any language problem?

Yes, the article requires proof reading and editing to meet academic standards of writing in English. This is especially crucial in the methodology, results and conclusions sections. Sometimes a sentence is not connected to the previous one or a sentence being cut in the middle.

6. Your decision for this manuscript: accept, minor, major or reject

I think this is an important and uniquely geographically situated study that could contribute to this important topic. However, the paper requires thorough editing, proof reading and visualization of the methodology and results sections. While the introduction and literature review sections need mainly language improvements and more flow and focus, the methodology, results and conclusions sections require major revision to bring them to the standard academic level.

I look forward to reading this paper after it is revised.

7. Comments to the Author:

I think this is an important and uniquely geographically situated study that could contribute to this important topic. However, the paper requires thorough editing, proof reading and visualization of the methodology and results sections. While the introduction and literature review sections need mainly language improvements and more flow and focus, the methodology, results and conclusions sections require major revision to bring them to the standard academic level.

I look forward to reading this paper after it is revised.

1. How do you rate the significance of the research (in a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the most significant)?

I would rate the significance of this research as **5**. This study focuses on the critical application of artificial intelligence in news sites. By revealing the extent of AI application, the success of AI applications in developing news content, as well as challenges met by headers and editors, the result provides valuable insights for both academics and industry professionals. The research aligns with global trends and has the potential to significantly impact the future of media, making it a highly valuable contribution to the field.

2. How do you rate the originality (in a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest)?

I would rate the originality of this research as **4**. This study designed a questionnaire that includes 3 dimensions and ensured validity and reliability. The questionnaire was uploaded electronically to the Google survey website, and then sent to the accounts of the said Sample. The originality lies in how the research examines AI's role in enhancing news sites' practices, which is still an emerging area. However, the methodology itself—an online survey—while effective, is widely used, which slightly limits the score in terms of methodological innovation.

3. How do you rate the experimental design and quality of data (in a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest)?

I would rate the experimental design and quality of data as **3**. While the online survey is appropriate for gathering editors' opinion and perception, there are limitations in research design. First of all, further details need to be provided on the criteria and rationalization of the sample size. In addition, the paper didn't mention quality control methods of during the survey process, and quality of collected questionnaires was not reported.

4. Is the organization of the article appropriate?

The overall organization of the article is generally clear, but it lacks key sociodemographic information about the participants involved, which is crucial for contextualizing the findings. Additionally, the discussion section does not adequately explain the study limitations.

5. Did you find any language problem?

I encountered several language problems throughout the article. Some sentences are too long to understand, and some expressions are not native enough. These issues impact the overall readability and clarity of the manuscript. I recommend a thorough revision for language improvement, possibly with the help of a professional editor, to ensure the content is more easily understood by readers.

6. Your decision for this manuscript: accept, minor, major or reject

My decision is reconsideration after **major** revision. While the research is significant and offers valuable insights, there are several critical issues that need to be addressed before the manuscript

can be considered for publication.

7. Comments to the Author:

I have some comments to the author:

(1) Some sentences are hard to understand (Like row 10-11, row 29-35, row 57-63, 90-100). I recommend that the author further polish this paper to ensure the expressions are clear and accessible.

(2) The citation in the text (row 56) referencing (Jabri, 2023) does not correspond to any entry in the reference list. Please verify the citation and ensure the reference is correctly included in the bibliography.

(3) The name mentioned in the text on line 177 does not match the one listed in the references. Please verify and correct the discrepancy.

(4) Check "reliability" and "validity" in row 302 and 317, for Cronbach's alpha is a measure of reliability.

(5) I recommend participants' sociodemographic information and quality of collected questionnaires need to be reported in result.

(6) I recommend further explanation of results in the discussion section, as well as study limitations.

(7) Check the compliance of the form.