

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54329

Date: 14-10-2025

Title: Artificial Intelligence in Campus Security and Crisis prediction A Review of Current Applications and Future Trends

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: **Sudhanshu Sekhar Tripathy**

Date: 14-10-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewer's name.

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

The manuscript presents a comprehensive and systematic review of artificial intelligence (AI) applications in campus security and crisis prediction. It effectively integrates literature from the past five years to identify major developments, challenges, and future research trends in smart campus security systems. The topic is highly relevant in today's educational technology landscape. The paper demonstrates solid analytical depth, strong organization, and a well-structured literature base. However, a few areas—mainly related to presentation, figure clarity, and minor language issues—require revision for publication readiness.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. Scope & Relevance

- The paper aligns strongly with the journal's scope in AI applications and educational safety.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Addresses a significant and emerging topic—AI-driven campus safety and crisis management.
- Provides a timely and broad synthesis of multidisciplinary literature (AI, IoT, NLP, and psychology).

2. Structure & Technical Presentation

- Structure is logical (Abstract → Introduction → Literature Review → Applications → Challenges → Future Directions → Conclusion).
- Figures and tables (especially the literature screening flowchart) support the discussion but should have clearer captions and consistent numbering.
- Some sections (e.g., Sections 3.1–3.3) are lengthy; sub-section summarization or bullet highlights could improve readability.

3. Methodological / Analytical Details

- The paper employs a systematic review framework with a defined inclusion process (Web of Science, Elsevier, EBSCO, CSCD).
- Selection criteria and categorization are well-presented but could include a **PRISMA-style diagram** or explicit mention of publication years analyzed.
- Integration across domains (physical, cyber, and psychological security) is comprehensive and insightful.
- More quantitative synthesis (e.g., statistical distribution of reviewed studies by method or application) would further strengthen analytical depth.

4. References & Citations

- References are rich and up to date, including numerous works from 2023–2025.
- Minor formatting inconsistencies (author initials, capitalization, and line breaks) should be corrected.
- A few classic foundational works on AI ethics and explainability (pre-2020) could be cited for balance.

5. Language & Style

- The manuscript is well-written and academic in tone.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Some long sentences could be shortened to enhance clarity.
- Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are recommended (e.g., article usage, punctuation).
- The abstract could be slightly condensed for focus and readability.

6. Key Strengths

- Systematic and multidisciplinary review covering AI in physical security, cybersecurity, and mental health monitoring.
- Integrates ethical, technical, and governance aspects—rarely found in one paper.
- Provides clear future directions (AI ethics, federated learning, multimodal data fusion).
- Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of AI-driven smart campus frameworks.

7. Areas for Improvement (Minor Revision Needed)

- Add a **graphical summary or conceptual framework** depicting AI integration in campus safety.
- Improve figure clarity and ensure consistent table/figure numbering.
- Standardize references (APA or IEEE format).
- Refine long sentences for better readability.
- Add a short limitations paragraph before the conclusion.

Final Feedback to Author

The paper makes a significant and timely contribution to the literature on AI-based campus security. It is well-researched, methodically presented, and provides valuable insights for researchers and policymakers. Minor editorial revisions in language, figure formatting, and reference style are recommended to ensure clarity and consistency.