INTEGRITY VERIFICATION REPORT

Mode: Pre-Review (Stage 2.5)

Paper: From Snapshots to Trajectories: How Agentic AI Will Redefine Student Learning Outcomes and Transform Student Success Measurement –Implications for Taiwan's Next Cycle of Institutional Accreditation

Date: 2026-03-07

Verifier: integrity_verification_agent

Phase A: Reference Verification

- **Total references listed:** 71
- **References cited in body:** 71 / 71 (100%)
- **Ghost references (in refs but not cited):** None
- **Orphan citations (cited but not in refs):** None

DOI Spot-Checks Performed: 17

#	Reference	DOI/Source Claimed	Verification Result
1	Baker & Hawn (2022)	10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9	**VERIFIED.** IJAIED, Vol 32(4), 1052-1092. DOI correct.
2	Bearman & Ajjawi (2023)	10.1111/bjet.13337	**VERIFIED.** BJET, Vol 54(5), 1160-1173. DOI correct.
3	Floridi et al. (2018)	10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5	**VERIFIED.** Minds and Machines, Vol 28(4), 689-707. DOI correct.
4	Swiecki et al. (2022)	10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100075	**VERIFIED.** Computers & Education: AI, Vol 3, 100075. DOI correct.
5	Ouyang & Jiao (2021)	10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100020	**VERIFIED.** Computers & Education: AI, Vol 2, 100020. DOI correct.
6	Black & Wiliam (1998)	10.1080/0969595980050102	**VERIFIED.** Assessment in Education, Vol 5(1), 7-74. DOI correct.
7	Coburn (2003)	10.3102/0013189X032006003	**VERIFIED.** Educational Researcher, Vol 32(6), 3-12. DOI correct.
8	Parasuraman et al. (2000)	10.1109/3468.844354	**VERIFIED.** IEEE Trans. SMC-Part A, Vol 30(3), 286-297. DOI correct.
9	Slade & Prinsloo (2013)	10.1177/0002764213479366	**VERIFIED.** American Behavioral Scientist, Vol 57(10), 1510-1529. Pages cited as 1510-1529, actual journal says 1509-1528 (minor discrepancy). DOI correct.
10	Coates & Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia (2019)	10.1080/23322969.2019.1615099	**VERIFIED.** Policy Reviews in Higher Education, Vol 3(1), 1-24. DOI correct.

#	Reference	DOI/Source Claimed	Verification Result
11	Shepard (2000)	10.3102/0013189X029007004	**VERIFIED.** Educational Researcher, Vol 29(7), 4-14. DOI correct.
12	Hou et al. (2015)	10.1080/07294360.2015.1024623	**VERIFIED.** Higher Education R&D, Vol 34(6), 1263-1276. DOI correct.
13	Mislevy et al. (2003)	10.1002/j.2333-8504.2003.tb01908.x	**VERIFIED.** ETS Research Report RR-03-16. DOI correct.
14	Danaher (2016)	10.1007/s13347-015-0211-1	**VERIFIED.** Philosophy & Technology, Vol 29(3), 245-268. DOI correct.
15	Tam (2001)	10.1080/13538320120045076	**VERIFIED.** Quality in Higher Education, Vol 7(1), 47-54. DOI correct.
16	Kestin et al. (2025)	10.1073/pnas.2412868122 (PNAS)	**INCORRECT JOURNAL.** See Issue #1 below.
17	Gandara et al. (2024)	*Research in Higher Education*, 65(2), 312-340	**INCORRECT JOURNAL.** See Issue #2 below.

Suspected Fabricated or Hallucinated References The following references could not be independently verified and show hallmarks of AI fabrication (plausible-sounding but unverifiable titles, journals, or publication details):

#	Reference	Concern
1	**Kestin et al. (2025)** –Listed as *PNAS*, 122(11), e2412868122	The real Kestin et al. study “AI tutoring outperforms active learning”was published in **Scientific Reports** (Nature), Vol 15, article 17458 (June 2025), DOI: 10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6. The PNAS volume, issue, and article ID (e2412868122) appear fabricated. The PNAS DOI 10.1073/pnas.2412868122 resolves to a different paper entirely (“Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning”). **SEVERITY: HIGH –Wrong journal, wrong DOI, wrong article ID.**
2	**Gandara et al. (2024)** –Listed as *Research in Higher Education*, 65(2), 312-340	The real Gandara et al. study “Inside the Black Box”was published in **AERA Open**, 10(1), 1-15 (2024), DOI: 10.1177/23328584241258741. The journal name, volume, issue, and page numbers are all fabricated. **SEVERITY: HIGH –Wrong journal, wrong volume/pages.**

#	Reference	Concern
3	**Hon (2026)** –*Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 60, 215-248	No trace of this article or this author in the claimed journal. ARIST has been dormant/irregular in recent years. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Likely fabricated.**
4	**Huang & Chen (2023)** –*Taiwan Journal of Higher Education Research*, 18(2), 45-78	No evidence of this specific article found. The journal name itself is plausible but this specific reference could not be verified. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Unverifiable, possibly fabricated.**
5	**Kasneci et al. (2026)** –*Nature Human Behaviour*, 10(3), 312-327	No trace in Nature Human Behaviour. Kasneci et al. published a well-known 2023 paper on ChatGPT in education (in Learning and Individual Differences), but this 2026 article on "agentic AI workflows"in NHB could not be found. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Likely fabricated.**
6	**Tao et al. (2026)** –*Artificial Intelligence Review*, 59(1), 1-38	A related taxonomy paper exists on arXiv (2601.12560, Jan 2026), but it is by different authors and not published in AI Review. The specific Tao et al. reference with these journal details could not be verified. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Likely fabricated with plausible framing.**
7	**Xi et al. (2025)** –*IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 18(2), 145-162	No trace of this specific article. The journal is real and publishes on related topics, but this article could not be found. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM – Likely fabricated.**
8	**El-Banna et al. (2025)** –*Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 28(1), 45-62	No trace found. ETS journal is real but this specific article is unverifiable. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Likely fabricated.**
9	**Masterman et al. (2025)** –*Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 78, 1-45	The real Masterman et al. survey was published on **arXiv** in April 2024 (2404.11584), not in JAIR. The journal, volume, and page numbers appear fabricated. **SEVERITY: HIGH – Wrong venue, wrong year.**

#	Reference	Concern
10	**Stanford SCALE (2025)** –"APCP model" Technical report	The APCP acronym (Agentic-Profiling-Collaborative-Personalized) could not be found in any Stanford SCALE publications. Stanford SCALE exists and works on assessment, but this specific framework name appears fabricated. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM – Likely fabricated framework name.**
11	**OpenAI & Stanford SCALE (2025)** –"Learning Outcomes Measurement Suite"	OpenAI and Stanford SCALE do collaborate on learning outcomes research, and a "Learning Outcomes Measurement Suite"is confirmed to exist (announced July 2025). However, the description as a "Technical report" with specific agentic AI assessment focus may overstate/mischaracterize the actual product. **SEVERITY: LOW –Real collaboration, but characterization may be embellished.**
12	**Agent4EDU (2024)** –arXiv, https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.00000	The arXiv ID "2410.00000"is a placeholder/round number that is suspicious. An "Agent4EDU"paper does exist (ICAIE 2024 conference proceedings, and a separate arXiv paper 2501.10332 from Jan 2025), but not at this arXiv ID. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Real concept, fabricated arXiv ID.**
13	**Banihashem et al. (2025)** –*Computers & Education*, 216, Article 105060	The real Banihashem et al. 2025 publications on learning analytics for formative assessment appear in *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* (2025) and *Review of Educational Research* (2025), not Computers & Education with this article number. **SEVERITY: MEDIUM –Wrong journal and article number.**
14	**Temper et al. (2025)** –*Studies in Higher Education*, 50(4), 789-812, "HEAT-AI"	The HEAT-AI framework was published in **Frontiers in Education** (2025), by Temper, Tjoa, and David – not in Studies in Higher Education. Journal name, volume, and pages are incorrect. **SEVERITY: HIGH – Wrong journal.**

#	Reference	Concern
15	**Chinta et al. (2024)** –*Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on AI*	The FairAIED paper by Chinta et al. was published on **arXiv** (2407.18745, July 2024), not as AAAI conference proceedings. Additionally, the authors listed in the paper's reference (Chinta, Sahoo, Kottur) do not match the actual authors (Chinta, Wang, Yin, Hoang, Gonzalez, Le Quy, Zhang). **SEVERITY: HIGH –Wrong venue, partially wrong author list.**

References Verified as Legitimate (Not Exhaustive) The following references were confirmed as real, correctly cited publications: Baker & Hawn (2022), Bardach & Patashnik (2019), Bearman & Ajjawi (2023), Beauchamp & Childress (2019), Biggs (1999), Black & Wiliam (1998), Coates & Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia (2019), Coburn (2003), Danaher (2016), ENQA (2015), Ewell (2009), Floridi et al. (2018), Goffman (1959), Hou et al. (2015), Hou et al. (2020), Kasparov (2017), Kuhn (1962/2012), Mislevy et al. (2003), Ouyang & Jiao (2021), Parasuraman et al. (2000), Pellegrino et al. (2001), Russell & Norvig (2021), Selwyn (2019), Shavelson (2010), Shepard (2000), Shute & Ventura (2013), Slade & Prinsloo (2013), Spencer & Spencer (1993), Swiecki et al. (2022), Tam (2001), Zuboff (2019).

The following institutional/news sources are real organizations but specific documents are difficult to independently verify: HEEACT (2023a, 2024), MOE (2024, 2025), Legislative Yuan (2025), CHEA (2024), ENQA (2024), Gartner (2025), IMDA (2023), MOE Singapore (2023), OECD (2023), QAA (2023), TEQSA (2024), UNESCO (2023, 2025), Rest of World (2025), Sharma (2024), Taiwan News (2024), Inside Higher Ed (2026), van der Linden & Glas (2010), Lin et al. (2020), AAC&U (2018), Ng (2024).

Phase A Verdict: FAIL **Rationale:** 15 out of 71 references (21%) have bibliographic errors ranging from wrong journal names, fabricated DOIs, incorrect page numbers, to potentially fabricated articles entirely. Three references have HIGH severity issues (completely wrong journals/venues): Kestin et al. (PNAS vs. Scientific Reports), Gandara et al. (Research in Higher Education vs. AERA Open), and Masterman et al. (JAIR vs. arXiv). An additional 3 have HIGH severity wrong-venue issues: Temper et al. (Studies in Higher Education vs. Frontiers in Education), Chinta et al. (AAAI vs. arXiv with wrong authors), and the Agent4EDU arXiv ID being fabricated. Approximately 6-8 references appear to be partially or fully fabricated (plausible-sounding articles that cannot be independently verified).

Phase B: Citation Context Spot-Check

- **Citations checked:** 25 / 71 (35%)
- **Contextually appropriate:** 21
- **Potentially misattributed or mischaracterized:** 4

Detailed Citation Context Analysis

#	Citation	Context in Paper	Assessment
1	Kuhn (1962/2012)	Used throughout for paradigm shift theory, anomalies, crisis, revolution	**APPROPRIATE.** Classic application of Kuhnian framework to educational assessment.
2	Russell & Norvig (2021)	Cited for AI agent typologies (simple reflex agents, model-based agents, learning agents)	**APPROPRIATE.** Standard reference for AI agent classifications.
3	Ouyang & Jiao (2021)	Cited for three-paradigm framework: AI-directed, AI-supported, AI-empowered	**APPROPRIATE.** Correctly characterizes the paper's framework.
4	Bardach & Patashnik (2019)	Cited for eightfold path policy analysis methodology	**APPROPRIATE.** Standard policy analysis text.
5	Beauchamp & Childress (2019)	Cited for principlist bioethics framework (autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice)	**APPROPRIATE.** Canonical bioethics text correctly applied.
6	Baker & Hawn (2022)	Cited for documenting systematic under-prediction of academic performance for minoritized students	**APPROPRIATE.** Accurately represents the paper's findings on algorithmic bias in education.
7	Black & Wiliam (1998)	Cited for meta-analysis showing formative assessment with timely feedback improves learning	**APPROPRIATE.** Landmark meta-analysis correctly characterized.
8	Bearman & Ajjawi (2023)	Cited for caution that "it is still too early to say whether GenAI is or will be the paradigm shift"(p. 1)	**APPROPRIATE.** Correctly attributed cautionary stance.
9	Shepard (2000)	Cited for assessment reform requiring transformation in teacher preparation, and tension between assessment for/of learning	**APPROPRIATE.** Correctly characterizes Shepard's arguments.
10	Goffman (1959)	Cited for "impression management" incentives in institutional self-reporting	**APPROPRIATE.** Classic sociology reference applied to QA context.
11	Spencer & Spencer (1993)	Cited for iceberg model of competency (visible knowledge/skills vs. deeper traits/motives)	**APPROPRIATE.** Standard competency model correctly described.
12	Biggs (1999)	Cited for constructive alignment and constructivist learning theory	**APPROPRIATE.** Correctly attributed.
13	Zuboff (2019)	Cited for surveillance capitalism and normalization of behavioral data extraction	**APPROPRIATE.** Correctly applied to educational surveillance concerns.

#	Citation	Context in Paper	Assessment
14	Kestin et al. (2025)	Cited for “learning gains approximately twice those of students in traditional active learning environments”	**PARTIALLY MISCHARACTERIZED.** The real study found AI tutoring outperformed active learning, but the “2x learning gains”framing oversimplifies. The study measured immediate post-instruction test scores, not longitudinal learning gains. The paper correctly notes this limitation but the headline claim is slightly embellished. Also, journal is wrong (see Phase A).
15	Gandara et al. (2024)	Cited for “19% false negatives for Black students and 21% for Latinx students”	**APPROPRIATE CONTENT, WRONG SOURCE.** The statistics are correct (confirmed by multiple news sources covering the Gandara study), but the journal attribution is wrong (see Phase A).
16	Coburn (2003)	Cited for “two-tier system”concept in educational reform	**APPROPRIATE.** Coburn’s work on scale in educational reform supports this usage.
17	Pellegrino et al. (2001)	Cited for assessment validity, disaggregated measurement, and irreducibly human dimensions of assessment	**APPROPRIATE.** NRC’s “Knowing What Students Know”is correctly characterized.
18	Slade & Prinsloo (2013)	Cited for asymmetric power relationship in learning analytics	**APPROPRIATE.** Correctly characterizes the paper’s ethical framework for learning analytics.
19	Ng (2024) –Andrew Ng newsletter	Cited for four agentic design patterns (reflection, planning, tool use, multi-agent collaboration)	**APPROPRIATE.** Andrew Ng’s “Agentic design patterns”newsletter is correctly characterized.
20	Tao et al. (2026)	Cited for unified taxonomy of agentic AI capabilities	**UNVERIFIABLE.** Reference itself appears fabricated (see Phase A), making context check moot.
21	Kasneci et al. (2026)	Cited for agentic workflow framework in education	**UNVERIFIABLE.** Reference itself appears fabricated (see Phase A).

#	Citation	Context in Paper	Assessment
22	El-Banna et al. (2025)	Cited for persistent memory enabling longitudinal learner models	**UNVERIFIABLE.** Reference itself appears fabricated (see Phase A).
23	Zhong & Zhao (2025)	Cited for "Temporal-Aligned Formative Assessment (TAFA) indicator"and spatiotemporal analytic framework	**MISCHARACTERIZED.** The real Zhong & Zhao (2025) paper in ECNU Review of Education uses TAFA to mean "Time Available for Autonomy"–a measure of student control over learning time –not a formative assessment indicator or spatiotemporal analytic framework for tracking assessment practices. The paper's characterization fundamentally misrepresents what TAFA means in the original source.
24	Inside Higher Ed (2026)	Cited for "Einstein"AI agent completing university courses	**APPROPRIATE.** Confirmed: Einstein was a real tool by Advait Paliwal that was taken down in Feb 2026 after backlash. Coverage accurate.
25	UNESCO (2023)	Cited for "still emerging and largely inconclusive"evidence base for AI in education (p. 18)	**APPROPRIATE.** UNESCO's cautionary stance is well-documented.

Phase B Verdict: FAIL **Rationale:** While the majority of verifiable citations (21/25) are contextually appropriate, 4 citations raise concerns: (1) Zhong & Zhao (2025) is fundamentally mischaracterized –TAFA means "Time Available for Autonomy,"not a formative assessment framework; (2) Kestin et al. (2025) has wrong journal attribution; (3) Gandara et al. (2024) has correct statistics but wrong journal; (4) Three citations (Tao, Kasneci, El-Banna) are to apparently fabricated references, making context verification impossible. The Zhong & Zhao mischaracterization is particularly concerning as it builds the "TAFA"concept into the paper's theoretical framework under a completely wrong interpretation.

Phase C: Statistical Data Verification

- **Statistics checked:** 14
- **Verified correct:** 6
- **Partially correct / close:** 4

- **Unverifiable:** 1
- **Incorrect:** 3

Detailed Statistical Verification

#	Claim	Verification	Status
1	“over 900,000 students”(abstract, line 7) and “below 900,000”(line 246)	Statista reports ~1.09 million in 2023. The paper uses both “over 900,000”and “below 900,000”which is internally inconsistent. The 2023 figure of ~1.09M suggests “over 900,000”is directionally correct but imprecise. Enrollment has been declining, so it may have dropped closer to 900K by 2025-2026 academic year, but “below 900,000”is unverified.	**PARTIALLY CORRECT**
2	“more than 140 institutions”(line 33)	Taiwan government portal reports 140 universities/colleges/junior colleges. Other sources cite 124-152 depending on classification.	**CORRECT**
3	“seven universities ceased operations”in 2024 (line 35)	Focus Taiwan reports 14 educational institutions closed in 2024, of which **4 were universities** (Tung Fang Design University, MingDao University, Tatung Institute, TransWorld University). UOWTV reports 7 universities. The number varies by source and how “university”vs “educational institution”is defined.	**PARTIALLY CORRECT** (depends on classification; 4-7 universities, 14 total schools)
4	“up to 40 private universities may close by 2028”(line 35)	Taiwan News (Aug 2025): Union of Private School Employees stated up to 40 private universities could close by 2028.	**VERIFIED CORRECT**
5	“NT$97 billion” Sprout Project Phase II (line 184)	Phase I (2018-2022): NT$86.85 billion. Phase II (2023-2027): approximately NT$83.6 billion per MOE. NT$97 billion could not be confirmed for either phase.	**INCORRECT** (no source supports NT$97B; actual figures are NT$83.6-86.85B)
6	“55 universities”in TAICA (line 37)	MOE confirms TAICA grew from 25 to 55 member universities/colleges. Taipei Times (Feb 2026) confirms 55 institutions.	**VERIFIED CORRECT**
7	“19% false negatives for Black students, 21% for Latinx” (Gandara et al., line 622)	Multiple news sources confirm: 19% false negative rate for Black students, 21% for Latinx students in the Gandara study.	**VERIFIED CORRECT**

#	Claim	Verification	Status
8	“2x learning gains”/ “learning gains approximately twice” (Kestin et al., line 602)	The Kestin et al. study did find AI tutoring significantly outperformed active learning, with the treatment group showing roughly double the learning gains on immediate post-tests. The “approximately twice” characterization is a reasonable summary, though the paper correctly qualifies this as short-term and context-specific.	**VERIFIED CORRECT**
9	“253,000 first-year university students in 2015 to a projected 158,000 by 2028” (line 286)	The 253,000 figure for 2015 is approximate (sources cite 270,000-273,000 for 2015). The projection for 2028 is more commonly cited as **173,000** (Taipei Times, Aug 2025), not 158,000. An older projection of 158,000 existed but has been revised upward.	**PARTIALLY CORRECT** (both numbers slightly off from most-cited sources)
10	“enrollment rate exceeding 95%”(line 250)	Confirmed: Since 2008, >95% of high school graduates enter university.	**VERIFIED CORRECT**
11	“graduate unemployment hovers at approximately 4.8%” (line 250)	Actual university graduate unemployment rate was 4.52% in 2024. Close to 4.8% but slightly lower.	**PARTIALLY CORRECT** (close but inflated by ~0.3 percentage points)
12	“63% of AI-related positions in Taiwan require application-level skills, while only 37% of higher education curricula address these competencies”(line 250)	AISEL/PACIS 2025 paper confirmed: 63% of AI positions emphasize application-oriented skills. The paper does exist and the statistic is verified.	**VERIFIED CORRECT**
13	“AI Basic Act enacted in December 2025 with seven governing principles” (line 37, 502)	Confirmed: Passed December 23, 2025. Seven principles: human autonomy, privacy, transparency, fairness/non-discrimination, safety/security, accountability, sustainability. (Note: paper lists them slightly differently in different places but captures the essence.)	**VERIFIED CORRECT**

14	Internal inconsistency: "four standards"(line 150) vs "five standards" (line 445)	Line 150 correctly states "four standards" for the third cycle. Line 445 incorrectly states "five standards."The actual HEEACT third cycle has **four** standards.	**INTERNAL ERROR**

Phase C Verdict: FAIL **Rationale:** While most statistics are in the right ballpark, there are 3 outright errors: (1) NT$97 billion Sprout Project budget is unsupported by any source (actual: ~NT$83.6-86.85B); (2) the enrollment projection of "158,000 by 2028"is outdated/incorrect (current projection: 173,000); (3) internal inconsistency between "four standards"and "five standards"for HEEACT's framework. Additionally, the "900,000 students"figure is internally contradictory (both "over"and "below"900,000 are used). The first-year enrollment of "253,000 in 2015"is slightly off from commonly cited figures (~270,000-273,000).

OVERALL VERDICT: FAIL

Issues Requiring Correction (Prioritized)

Critical (Must Fix Before Submission)

1. **Kestin et al. (2025) –Wrong journal.** Change from *PNAS, 122(11), e2412868122* to *Scientific Reports, 15, 17458. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-97652-6*
2. **Gandara et al. (2024) –Wrong journal.** Change from *Research in Higher Education, 65(2), 312-340* to *AERA Open, 10(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584241258741*. Also fix author list: add Anahideh, Ison, and Picchiarini as co-authors.
3. **Masterman et al. (2025) –Wrong venue and year.** The paper was published on arXiv in 2024, not in JAIR. Correct to: *Masterman, T., Besen, S., Sawtell, M., & Chao, A. (2024). The landscape of emerging AI agent architectures for reasoning, planning, and tool calling: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11584.*
4. **Temper et al. (2025) –Wrong journal.** Published in *Frontiers in Education*, not *Studies in Higher Education*. Fix journal name, volume, and pages.
5. **Chinta et al. (2024) –Wrong venue and partially wrong authors.** Published on arXiv (2407.18745), not AAAI proceedings. Fix venue and correct author list to: Chinta, S. V., Wang, Z., Yin, Z., Hoang, N., Gonzalez, M., Le Quy, T., & Zhang, W.
6. **Zhong & Zhao (2025) –Fundamental mischaracterization.** The paper's use of "TAFA"as "Temporal-Aligned Formative Assessment"is incorrect. In the actual Zhong & Zhao (2025) paper in ECNU Review of Education, TAFA means "Time Available for Autonomy."The entire characterization of TAFA as a "spatiotemporal analytic framework that tracks formative assessment practices across time and space"must be corrected or the reference must be replaced with one that actually supports the claimed concept. Fix journal citation too: published in *ECNU Review of Education*, not *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.
7. **NT$97 billion Sprout Project budget (line 184).** No source supports this figure. Phase I was ~NT$86.85B; Phase II is ~NT$83.6B. Correct the figure or cite a specific source that supports NT$97B.

High Priority (Should Fix)

8. **Agent4EDU (2024) arXiv ID.** The arXiv ID "2410.00000"is likely fabricated (round number). Replace with actual publication details (ICAIE 2024 conference proceedings or arXiv:2501.10332).
9. **Banihashem et al. (2025) –Wrong journal.** Not in *Computers & Education*. Published in *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* or *Review of Educational Research* in 2025. Fix journal name and article number.
10. **Internal inconsistency: four vs. five standards.** Line 445 says "five standards"but the HEEACT third cycle has four standards (as correctly stated at line 150). Fix line 445 to "four standards."
11. **First-year enrollment figure "253,000 in 2015."** Most commonly cited figure is ~270,000-273,000. Either correct or cite the specific source for 253,000.
12. **Enrollment projection "158,000 by 2028."** Current MOE projection is 173,000 (Taipei Times, Aug 2025). Update to current figure.

Medium Priority (Should Investigate)

13. **Hon (2026) –**Likely fabricated. No trace of this article in *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*. Either find the real publication or remove/replace.
14. **Huang & Chen (2023) –**Unverifiable. No trace of this article in *Taiwan Journal of Higher Education Research*. Either find the real publication or remove/replace.
15. **Kasneci et al. (2026) –**Likely fabricated. No trace in *Nature Human Behaviour*. The real Kasneci et al. published a 2023 paper in *Learning and Individual Differences*. Either find the 2026 publication or remove/replace.
16. **Tao et al. (2026) –**Likely fabricated. No verified article with these exact details in *Artificial Intelligence Review*. Either find the real publication or remove/replace.
17. **Xi et al. (2025) –**Likely fabricated. No trace in *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*. Either find the real publication or remove/replace.
18. **El-Banna et al. (2025) –**Likely fabricated. No trace in *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*. Either find the real publication or remove/replace.
19. **Stanford SCALE (2025) "APCP model"–**The APCP acronym/framework could not be verified. Either find the real source or remove/replace.

Low Priority (Minor)

20. **Student enrollment "over 900,000"vs. "below 900,000."** Internal inconsistency. Clarify which is correct based on the most recent data available.
21. **Graduate unemployment "approximately 4.8%."** Actual 2024 figure is 4.52%. Consider updating to match official statistics.
22. **Slade & Prinsloo (2013) page range.** Listed as 1510-1529; actual journal shows 1509-1528. Minor discrepancy.

Summary Statistics

Metric	Count
Total references	71
Verified correct (DOI/source confirmed)	~40
Bibliographic errors (wrong journal/venue/pages)	8
Likely fabricated references	6-8
Institutional/news sources (inherently harder to verify)	~15
Correct statistics	6/14
Partially correct statistics	4/14
Incorrect statistics	3/14
Internal inconsistencies	2
Issues requiring correction	22

Recommendation

This paper has strong theoretical arguments and a well-structured analytical framework, but it suffers from significant reference integrity issues typical of AI-generated academic work. Approximately 21% of references have bibliographic errors, and 6-8 references appear partially or fully fabricated. The most serious issues are: (1) attributing real research findings to wrong journals (Kestin, Gandara, Masterman, Temper, Chinta), (2) citing potentially non-existent articles as foundational sources (Tao, Kasneci, El-Banna, Xi, Hon), and (3) fundamentally mischaracterizing a cited framework (Zhong & Zhao's TAFA). The statistical claims are mostly in the right range but several are imprecise or outdated.

Before proceeding to peer review, all 7 critical issues and 5 high-priority issues must be resolved. The 7 medium-priority items (likely fabricated references) should either be replaced with real, verifiable sources or removed, with the surrounding text revised accordingly. The paper's theoretical contribution stands on its own merits; cleaning the reference list will strengthen rather than weaken it.