

Review Comments and Revisions Table

No.	Reviewer's Comment	Revision and Response	Page
1	Title too long; should be simplified. Reviewer 1 suggested adopting a concise version: "Leveraging Generative AI for Integrity Governance: Complementarity Between GDI and UNCAC Reports."	The title was revised according to the reviewer's suggestion. Redundant phrases were removed to enhance readability and align with journal standards for concise academic titles.	Cover Page
2	Abstract does not explicitly state the main findings or contributions. Reviewer 1 noted that the abstract should highlight how AI enhanced the evaluation framework and what implications were found regarding whistleblower protection.	The abstract was revised to include a new sentence specifying the key findings and contributions: "The AI-driven approach reveals critical policy gaps through cross-index pattern recognition, particularly demonstrating how integrating GDI Question 29 with UNCAC Articles 32–33 exposes legislative inconsistencies in whistleblower protection mechanisms." This addition clarifies the AI's role in strengthening the evaluation framework and articulates the study's empirical contribution.	p.1
3	Methodological discussion lacks sufficient explanation of validity and reliability for AI-assisted analysis.	A new subsection titled " Validity and Reliability of AI-Assisted Analysis " was added. It introduces a triangulation	pp.16–17

No.	Reviewer's Comment	Revision and Response	Page
	Reviewer 1 requested clearer justification for the accuracy and credibility of AI-generated findings.	framework combining (1) cross-model verification between ChatGPT-4 and Claude 3, (2) expert validation of secondary data, and (3) cross-referencing with official GDI and UNCAC materials. The section also explains manual contextual review and bias-mitigation measures to ensure transparency and reproducibility.	
4	Research Analysis section does not sufficiently demonstrate the application of generative AI. Reviewer 2 requested a clearer explanation of how AI was used in practice.	Clarifications were added in Section IV: Scenario Simulation (AI Roles and Prompts). The manuscript now explains that, to maintain conciseness, the main text focuses on analytical outcomes, while the underlying AI-assisted process involved both structured prompt engineering and Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) using previous GDI and UNCAC evaluation materials. Three AI personas were developed—(1) <i>Primary Assessor</i>, (2) <i>Peer Reviewer</i>, and (3) <i>Government Assessor</i>—to simulate different evaluative roles. This design	pp.24–26

No.	Reviewer's Comment	Revision and Response	Page
		ensured that AI outputs aligned with real-world assessment logic and policy language while maintaining analytical integrity.	