



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	I or GAI? A Comparative Analysis of Human and Genrative Artificial Intelligence Translations
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the value of the manuscript and recommend revisions to improve its clarity, coherence, and overall quality. The authors are advised to thoughtfully address and incorporate all reviewer comments in the revised version.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript explores a highly relevant and timely topic on the comparative performance of human translators versus Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) in the context of literary translation. Given the rapid integration of AI in educational and professional settings, this study has the potential to offer valuable insights.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
1. Title and Abstract a. There is a glaring typo in the title. "Genrative" must be corrected to "Generative". b. The abstract mentions a total of 20 translated texts. However, the methodology vaguely mentions gathering insights from Third Year College students of Bachelor of Secondary Education Major in English without specifying the exact number of participants or the specific GAI platforms utilized. The researchers must ensure that the abstract accurately reflects the specific details found in the methodology.
2. Introduction a. The paper cites AI Statistics and Trends for 2025 to support the claim that 77% of the population has access to AI. This appears to be a commercial or blog source rather than a peer-reviewed academic reference. For a high-impact journal, please utilize reputable academic sources to establish your background. b. Some sentences lean towards being colloquial or conversational (e.g., "Nowadays, users, most especially students, are looking for convenience..."). I suggest elevating the academic tone throughout this section.
3. Methodology a. The researchers state that the design is a comparative content analysis and that data were analyzed using qualitative methods. However, the Results section presents highly specific quantitative data (e.g., an accuracy score of 86.4%). The researchers must explicitly explain



how qualitative translation evaluations were converted into these exact percentages. Was a Likert scale used? Who computed the scores?

b. Who evaluated the translations for Accuracy, Expression, and Elegance? If the researchers themselves rated the translations, how was inter-rater reliability established to avoid bias? If a panel of experts was used, their qualifications must be stated.

c. The researchers used Dr. Jose Rizal's "Sa Aking Mga Kabata". Translating a 19th-century Tagalog poem is an advanced, specialized task that requires professional literary expertise. Using 3rd-year BSEd students to represent "Human Translation" in this highly complex context may not yield a fair comparison, and poetry is notoriously the weakest area for current AI models. The researchers need to justify why this specific poem was chosen over standard academic or conversational texts, and clearly state this limitation.

4. Results and Discussion

a. Tables 1 through 6 present percentages comparing Human and GAI translations. If this is a comparative study, simply stating that 95% is higher than 86.4% is insufficient. The researchers need to apply the appropriate statistical test (e.g., t-test or ANOVA) to determine if the difference in scores is statistically significant.

b. In the excerpts provided (e.g., "Encountered a problem, the boat in the lake a long time ago"), the human translation is grammatically flawed. Yet, the overall Human Translation scored 95% in Elegance. The researchers must address this discrepancy. How can the human translations be deemed highly elegant if the provided examples show awkward sentence construction?

c. Ensure that table labels and notes follow standard APA format. Avoid leaving table headers and notes visually detached from the data.

5. References

a. Please review the reference list for consistency. Several entries lack DOIs, and some URLs appear to be broken or point to generic blog sites (e.g., eLearning Industry, Day Translations Blog, Whizwordz). Replace these with peer-reviewed literature wherever possible.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
☐	Accept the manuscript for publication.
☐	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
☐	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations

This paper has a relevant and timely topic and the comparison between human and GAI translation can be useful, especially for literary and educational contexts. The paper already shows a clear direction, but in my view the main issue is that the study design and the way the results were produced are still not strong enough yet to support the conclusions with enough confidence.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

My major concern is the methodological rigor of the comparison. The paper says it used content analysis, but the procedure for judging accuracy, expression, and elegance is still too unclear and too subjective. It is not well explained who evaluated the translations, how many raters were involved, how the scores such as 95%, 86.4%, and 34.2% were computed, and what exact basis was used to classify a translation as word-for-word, grammatical, idiomatic, or communicative. Because of this, the reader may question if the differences between human and GAI translation really came from the data or only from the researchers' own impression. I suggest the authors strengthen this part first by explaining the scoring procedure in a more concrete and replicable way, including the evaluation rubric, the rating process, and how consistency of judgment was ensured. Without this clarification, the findings may appear interesting, but not yet fully convincing. Also, the study uses one poem only, so the claims should be presented more carefully and limited to this very specific text type. If the authors revise this major part well, the paper can become much stronger and more credible.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			