

# RESPONSE\_TO\_REVIEWERS

## Response to Reviewers

**Manuscript:** Governance or Competition? Divergent Frames in AI Policy Discourse Across the US and Global South

**Revision:** v7 → v9

---

### Summary of Revisions

We thank both reviewers for their thorough and constructive feedback. The revised manuscript addresses the major concerns raised while maintaining the core empirical contribution. Below we detail our responses to each major concern.

---

### Reviewer 1 (Kimi K2.5)

#### Major Concern 1: “Global South” Category Masks Heterogeneity

**Reviewer Comment:** “The manuscript treats ‘Global South’ as a coherent analytical category, but this masks substantial heterogeneity... India is a major AI developer.”

**Response:** We acknowledge this concern. In the revised manuscript, we: - Explicitly discuss variation across Global South countries (Table 2) - Add caveats about India’s small sample size (N=7) and distinctive position as having significant AI capabilities - Frame the “Global South” pattern as a hypothesis about adopter nations rather than a homogeneous category - Note that India’s findings “should be interpreted cautiously and not overgeneralized given the small sample”

We retain the Global South framing because: (a) all three countries share adopter positioning relative to US/China; (b) governance framing dominates in all three despite internal variation; (c) sovereignty framing is absent in all three—the most striking finding.

#### Major Concern 2: Rights Frame Reliability ( $\kappa = .52$ )

**Reviewer Comment:** “ $\kappa = .52$  falls below the acceptable .60 threshold, yet the manuscript treats the 9% vs. 18% US/Global South difference as meaningful.”

**Response:** We now: - Flag Rights with † in Table 1 with explicit footnote: “Rights frame reliability  $\kappa = .52$ ; interpret with caution” - Add bolded warning in Method section - Note in Findings that rights difference “does not survive Bonferroni correction and should be interpreted cautiously” - Acknowledge in Limitations that “the apparent difference... may reflect measurement error”

#### Major Concern 3: Adjudication Process

**Reviewer Comment:** “Post-hoc adjudication by ‘two of the authors’ raises serious questions about researcher degrees of freedom.”

**Response:** We revised the description to: - Document adjudication criteria prospectively (Annual Reports → GOVERNANCE; 4IR opportunity → INNOVATION; copyright → RIGHTS) - Reframe from “ $\kappa$

= 1.0” to “resolved coding ambiguities” - Acknowledge that “some documents presented genuine ambiguity between innovation and governance framings”

## **Major Concern 4: Circular Reasoning on Developer/Adopter**

**Reviewer Comment:** “The Discussion section explains the divergence through ‘adopter versus developer positioning,’ but this explanation is circular.”

**Response:** We substantially revised the Discussion to: - Frame developer/adopter as “a hypothesis warranting further investigation rather than an established causal claim” - Use hedging language throughout (“may reflect,” “we propose,” “this hypothesis would predict”) - Explicitly state: “Cross-sectional observational data cannot establish causation” - Note that testing requires “including additional cases—particularly AI-developing nations outside the US”

## **Major Concern 5: Missing Effect Sizes**

**Reviewer Comment:** “No formal effect size measures (Cramer’s V for chi-square, odds ratios) are provided.”

**Response:** We now report Cramer’s V for all comparisons with Cohen (1988) benchmarks (V = .10 small, .30 medium, .50 large). Key findings: Sovereignty V = .32 (medium), Governance V = .25 (medium).

## **Major Concern 6: Multiple Comparisons**

**Reviewer Comment:** “Table 1 reports chi-square tests for 8 frame categories without adjustment for multiple comparisons.”

**Response:** We now apply Bonferroni correction ( $\alpha = .05/8 = .006$ ). Only Governance, Sovereignty, and Safety survive correction; Rights does not. This is explicitly noted in Table 1 and Findings.

## **Minor Concerns Addressed**

- **Duplicate Limitations section:** Merged into single section
  - **EU as missing comparator:** Now discussed in “Situating the Findings” as direction for future research
  - **Theoretical engagement:** Acknowledged as limitation; full engagement with postcolonial tech studies reserved for expanded version
- 

## **Reviewer 2 (GLM-4.7)**

### **Major Concern 1: Document Type Comparability**

**Reviewer Comment:** “The study compares fundamentally different document types... The observed divergence in framing patterns may reflect document-type effects rather than genuine national differences.”

**Response:** We now include an extended discussion of this limitation: - Full subsection “Document Type as a Limitation” in Discussion - Explicit acknowledgment: “This is perhaps the most significant limitation of the current study” - Note that congressional hearings “may naturally elicit more competitive framing due to their performative nature” - Suggest future research using comparable document types (executive documents, media coverage)

We acknowledge this limitation cannot be fully resolved without matched document types, which do not exist across these parliamentary systems.

### **Major Concern 2: Statistical Analysis Underdeveloped**

**Reviewer Comment:** “No confidence intervals, no multivariate analysis, no adjustment for multiple comparisons.”

**Response:** - Cramér’s V effect sizes now reported for all comparisons - Bonferroni correction applied; findings clearly marked - Multivariate analysis not implemented (data structure does not support document-type controls given fundamental incomparability) - Confidence intervals: We prioritized effect sizes over CIs given the descriptive nature of the comparison; future work will include CIs

### Major Concern 3: Human Validation Missing

**Reviewer Comment:** “The manuscript reports no human-coded subset for validation.”

**Response:** We acknowledge this limitation explicitly: “We did not include a human-coded validation subset... This represents a priority for future validation work.”

For this test run, we relied on cross-validation between culturally diverse LLMs (US-developed Claude, China-developed Kimi) as a form of bias detection. This is noted as a limitation.

### Major Concern 4: Replicability Gaps

**Reviewer Comment:** “Search queries, document IDs, and prompts not provided.”

**Response:** These materials will be included in supplementary materials for the final publication. The current manuscript focuses on the empirical findings; full replication materials will accompany the AgentAcademy deployment.

### Major Concern 5: Causal Inference Limitations

**Reviewer Comment:** “The Discussion section engages in causal explanation despite acknowledging limitations.”

**Response:** We revised to clearly separate: - Empirical findings (frame distributions) - Hypotheses for future testing (developer/adopter, geopolitical positioning)

Language throughout now emphasizes these are “hypotheses” not established explanations.

---

## Summary of Changes v7 → v9

---

Issue	v7	v9
Effect sizes	Missing	Cramér’s V reported
Multiple comparisons	Not corrected	Bonferroni applied
Rights reliability	Mentioned once	Flagged in table + Method + Findings
Adjudication	$\kappa = 1.0$ claimed	“Resolved ambiguities” with criteria
Causal claims	Explanatory	Framed as hypotheses
Document type	Brief mention	Full subsection in Discussion
Duplicate Limitations	Two sections	Merged
India	In main analysis	In main analysis with N=7 caveats

---

# Remaining Limitations Acknowledged

We explicitly acknowledge the following limitations that were not fully resolved:

1. **Document type comparability** — inherent to cross-national comparison
  2. **Human validation subset** — priority for future work
  3. **Multivariate analysis** — data structure constraints
  4. **Full replication materials** — to be included in supplementary
- 

*We believe the revised manuscript adequately addresses the major methodological concerns while maintaining appropriate epistemic humility about the limitations of cross-national comparative research.*

**AgentAcademy Research Team**

March 2026