ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59786

Title: Why Autonomous Systems Still Require Human Oversight.

Recommendation:
Accept as it is .....
Accept after Minor revision.....
Accept after Major revision...
Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. A.Poornima

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

Overall assessment: The manuscript, "Why Autonomous Systems Still Require Human Oversight", examines a timely and pertinent topic in the field of artificial intelligence and automation taking the perspective of AI ethics and governance. The topic has practical or academic value. The manuscript needs significant revisions, however, in terms of research design, methodological justification, presentation and interpretation of figures, before it can be accepted as a publication.

There were three major issues that needed to be revised:

1. Originality and research gap: Authors need to clearly define the study's research gap and explain why it fills a gap in existing research on human oversight of autonomous systems and AI governance. This contribution should be explicitly stated.

2. Sampling and generalisability: This study uses a convenience sampling of 51 respondents. The authors should explain the rationale for the number of cases studied and provide a more detailed description of the profile of respondents, and recognise that results may not be extrapolated to the general population. All claims made in the discussion and conclusion should be suitably restricted.

3. Research instrument and reliability: The questionnaire is self designed, though the steps taken to validate and ensure reliability of the instrument are not well explained. The reported Cronbach's Alpha of 0.672 is based on only two items. The authors should provide an explanation of the items included in the reliability test and justify the approach to the measurement indicating why they did so and should not make general statements about reliability without supporting evidence.

ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Statistical analysis: There is a lot of room for statistical section to be clarified. The authors should include the full Spearman correlation matrix, explain the process of creating the Human Oversight Score (HOS) and specify the variables/items that comprise the score. Contingency table, degrees of freedom, sample size and expected-frequency assumptions should be reported for each Chi-square test. The authors should also describe the selection of statistical tests and make sure that the tests correspond to the level of measurement and the research hypotheses.

5. Hypothesis testing and interpretation: Hypotheses should be clearly stated, and consistently translated to the appropriate statistical tests and results. It is important to correctly interpret statistical significance. For instance, the reported result for the relationship of trust in fully self-driving cars with preference for human override ($p = 0.110$) is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, and this should not be taken as an indication. Patterns of description do not necessarily reflect statistically significant associations.

6. Consistency of findings: It is important that those variables or labels and their interpretation presented in the results, discussion and conclusion are carefully cross checked by the writer. Specific mention must be made in particular of the use of AI, the support for human oversight and human override. Any percentages and statistical figures that are reported must be found in the data.

7. Literature review and discussion: This literature review is mainly descriptive. It should be reinforced by looking critically at previous studies and clarifying how the present findings support, extend or contradict previous studies. Comparisons should be made with only comparable constructs, questions and populations.

Conclusions should be changed in terms of the limited sample and the empirical statistical data. The authors have to make it clear, discuss the limitations of this convenience sampling, the small sample size and the self-developed questionnaire. Recommendations should be proportional to the results of this survey, and should not be simply presented as a result of this survey.

Recommendation: Manuscript has potential and covers an appropriate subject matter but the current manuscript does not demonstrate adequate methodological and analytical rigor. After major revision, I would recommend to accept if authors have responded to issues above and have done clear and verifiable statistical reporting.