



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “From Civic Voice to Synthetic Influence: AI, SDGs, and the Future of Political Communication”

Submitted: 17 August 2026

Accepted: 29 September 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Corresponding Author: Daniele Battista

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n29p55

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Anthony U. Utulu

School of Communication and the Arts, Regent University, VA, USA

Reviewer 2: Ouattara Aboubakar

Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: Aug. 27, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: Sept. 3, 2026
Manuscript Title: From Civic Voice to Synthetic Influence: AI and the Future of Political Communication	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No.	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes.	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes.	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
The title is concise, well--constructed, and accurately reflects the scope and central argument of the manuscript. It clearly communicates the thematic focus on artificial intelligence, political communication, and the evolving dynamics of civic voice. By foregrounding the shift from traditional civic expression to AI-mediated influence, the title effectively prepares the reader for the paper’s analytical framework and its emphasis on communication	

infrastructures. It is appropriately aligned with the content and captures both the conceptual and empirical dimensions explored in the study.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
The abstract is well-structured and clearly communicates the purpose, conceptual approach, and central findings of the study. It effectively introduces the four-dimensional framework and highlights the paper's contribution to understanding AI-mediated political communication. However, the methodological description remains somewhat brief. A short clarification of the qualitative review design and case-selection rationale would strengthen the abstract's clarity and give readers a more precise sense of how the analysis was conducted.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The manuscript is generally well-written and demonstrates a strong command of academic language and conceptual clarity. The arguments flow coherently, and the structure supports easy comprehension of the theoretical and analytical components. A few minor typographical and formatting issues are present (for example, "gmail.com"), but these do not impede understanding or detract from the overall quality of the work. A light proofreading pass is recommended to correct these small errors and ensure full consistency throughout the manuscript.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The qualitative review and comparative case approach are described sufficiently, offering a clear sense of how the authors integrate academic literature with illustrative institutional examples. The manuscript appropriately acknowledges methodological limitations, particularly regarding the interpretive nature of the design. However, the methodology section would benefit from a more explicit explanation of the case-selection criteria and rationale. Clarifying why these specific cases were chosen, and how they represent broader communicative dynamics, would strengthen transparency and enhance the reader's understanding of the analytical scope.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are conceptually coherent and well-organized through the four-V matrix, which provides a clear analytical structure for interpreting the communicative implications of AI-mediated political processes. Each dimension- visibility, voice, verifiability, and vulnerability is applied consistently across the illustrative cases, allowing readers to easily follow the comparative logic. The inclusion of the comparative table further enhances clarity by summarizing key contrasts and reinforcing the manuscript's analytical claims. Overall, the results are presented in a clear, systematic manner that supports the broader argument of the study.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions logically follow from the analysis and offer a clear synthesis of the manuscript's core insights. They effectively integrate the four-V framework and highlight its implications for democratic communication and AI governance. The authors successfully connect the empirical illustrations with broader normative considerations, showing how	

visibility, voice, verifiability, and vulnerability shape the democratic value of AI-mediated communication. Overall, the conclusions are well-grounded in the presented evidence and provide a coherent, meaningful closing to the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The reference list is extensive, current, and highly relevant to the manuscript's thematic focus. It draws from authoritative literature across political communication, AI ethics, platform governance, and sustainability communication, demonstrating strong engagement with both foundational and contemporary scholarship. The breadth of sources strengthens the theoretical grounding of the paper. However, the author should ensure that all hyperlinks are active and correctly formatted so that readers can easily access the cited materials. This minor adjustment will improve usability and maintain the professional quality of the reference section. A few examples include: https://doi.org/10.14668/QTimes_15408 is not active ; https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160 does not lead readers to the actual article .	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript is strong, timely, and theoretically grounded. It offers a well-developed contribution to communication-centred AI governance. The four-V framework is particularly valuable, providing a clear structure for assessing the democratic implications of AI-mediated communication. To further strengthen the manuscript, a few minor improvements are recommended:

1. Correcting small typographical and formatting errors to ensure full consistency.
2. Slightly expanding methodological clarity, especially regarding the rationale for case selection.
3. Ensuring consistent reference formatting and verifying that all links direct readers to the appropriate cited articles.

These modifications will enhance readability and technical accuracy without altering the substance of the work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement to the authors and editors of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published, or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 17 July, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 July, 2026
Manuscript Title: From Civic Voice to Synthetic Influence: AI and the Future of Political Communication	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4

<i>The title matches the content of the paper. However, I will suggest adding some keywords like SDG and Italy if the authors agree on my comments in track sheet regarding the title</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract is well structured</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No grammatical and spelling errors can be observed in the paper</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are also well stated in the text</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The discussion section should be reorganized to clearly show the results being discussed. Additionally, the authors should be more specific on the study area. It is too much clear. We do not know if they are working on some worldwide political communication illustrations as mentioned in their text or Italian cases. See comments in the text.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion matches the results</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Appropriate and relatively new bibliography</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):