



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 55485

Title: Artificial Intelligence in the Contemporary Political Scenario,

Recommendation:
Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓,			
Techn. Quality	✓,			
Clarity	✓,			
Significance	✓,			

Reviewer Name: Dr Abdul Haseeb Mir

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript undertakes a broad and ambitious examination of the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in contemporary politics, focusing on its evolution, applications in governance and electoral politics, ethical and legal challenges, and implications for international relations. The topic is undeniably timely and relevant, given the increasing centrality of algorithmic systems in democratic processes, public administration, and global power competition. The paper aims to provide a comprehensive overview of AI as a transformative political force, and in this respect it aligns well with current interdisciplinary debates in political science, public policy, and technology studies.

One of the manuscript's notable strengths is its wide thematic coverage. The author successfully traces the historical evolution of AI from its conceptual foundations in the mid-twentieth century to the contemporary era of machine learning and generative AI. The periodisation—from early computational tools to data-driven campaigning and the recent “AI election era”—is pedagogically useful and helps readers unfamiliar with the subject grasp the gradual deepening of AI's political relevance. The inclusion of global examples such as the Obama 2008 campaign, Cambridge Analytica, China's surveillance systems, India's digital governance initiatives, and the EU's regulatory leadership demonstrates awareness of comparative political contexts.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The paper also makes a meaningful contribution through its systematic identification of AI's applications in politics. The discussion of electoral targeting, strategic political communication, policy formulation, security and surveillance, diplomacy, and citizen participation is well structured and conceptually clear. Particularly valuable is the balanced acknowledgment that AI can enhance efficiency, inclusivity, and evidence-based policymaking while simultaneously posing risks to privacy, electoral integrity, and democratic deliberation. This dual emphasis reflects a mature understanding of AI as neither inherently democratic nor authoritarian, but politically contingent.

Another strength lies in the manuscript's normative and ethical engagement. The sections on misinformation, deepfakes, algorithmic bias, surveillance, and accountability raise crucial concerns that are central to contemporary political theory and governance debates. The discussion of ethical and legal frameworks—especially the UNESCO AI Ethics Recommendation, the EU AI Act, the US AI Bill of Rights, and India's National AI Strategy—adds policy relevance and situates the argument within ongoing regulatory efforts. The recommendations provided at the end of the paper are sensible, well aligned with the analysis, and framed in a globally inclusive manner.

However, despite these strengths, the manuscript suffers from significant weaknesses that limit its suitability for publication without substantial revision. The most serious concern relates to language and presentation. The paper contains pervasive grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, typographical inconsistencies, and unclear sentence construction that frequently obscure meaning. These issues go beyond minor copy-editing and substantially affect readability, coherence, and academic credibility. Extensive language revision is essential.

Conceptually, the manuscript remains largely descriptive. While it surveys a wide range of themes, it does not consistently develop a clear analytical or theoretical framework to integrate them. Key concepts such as “power,” “democracy,” “manipulation,” and “governance” are invoked but not sufficiently theorised. As a result, the paper sometimes reads as an extended overview rather than a focused scholarly argument. A sharper articulation of the paper's central thesis and its original contribution to political science literature would significantly strengthen the work.

Methodologically, the study relies entirely on secondary sources, which is acceptable for a conceptual or review article, but this choice is not clearly justified or reflected upon. The paper would benefit from

REVIEWER'S REPORT

explicitly positioning itself as a conceptual review or thematic synthesis, rather than implying empirical claims about impact and causality that cannot be substantiated without systematic data analysis. Additionally, some assertions—particularly regarding electoral manipulation and voter behaviour—are stated too categorically and should be qualified with greater caution.

Structurally, the manuscript is overextended. Several sections are repetitive, especially those dealing with misinformation, surveillance, and ethical risks. Condensing overlapping arguments and improving transitions between sections would enhance coherence and analytical flow. Figures are referenced but not always fully integrated into the discussion, and their analytical value could be better explained.

The conclusion effectively reiterates the importance of ethical governance and global cooperation but largely restates earlier points rather than synthesising insights or advancing a clear conceptual takeaway. A more focused conclusion highlighting the paper's unique contribution and future research directions would improve impact.

In sum, the article addresses a highly important and contemporary subject and demonstrates awareness of global debates, policy frameworks, and ethical concerns surrounding AI in politics. However, its current form falls short of academic publication standards due to language deficiencies, descriptive emphasis, and lack of conceptual consolidation.

Recommendation: The manuscript is recommended for publication only after major revisions, with priority given to (i) comprehensive language and stylistic editing, (ii) clearer articulation of theoretical contribution, (iii) reduction of repetition and structural tightening, and (iv) more cautious and analytically grounded claims.