

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No. IJAR-54602

Title: *The Effect of AI in Education: Reviews of Some Related Topics*

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: **Dr. Anam Zehra**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

A clear, accessible overview that introduces key AI-in-education concepts while weighing benefits against risks. The organization serves non-technical readers and emphasizes classroom implications. Still, labeling it a “review” requires a transparent search and selection process and a more explicit synthesis of evidence strength. With modest updates to methods reporting, evidence mapping, and practical implementation guidance, the paper can become a strong, policy-relevant resource.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

1. Broad survey of AI uses, explained in terms that educators and administrators can easily grasp.
2. Steady emphasis on adaptivity, feedback loops, and data-driven instruction maintains a clear conceptual throughline.
3. Even-handed treatment of benefits and risks, with attention to equity, privacy, and bias.
4. Coherent progression from vision to practice, consistently tied to classroom realities.
5. Strong primer for policymakers and institutional leaders who need a high-level overview.

WEAKNESSES

1. Missing a transparent review protocol (databases, search terms, inclusion/exclusion rules, screening flow).
2. Thin empirical grounding, few effect sizes or comparators, and limited discussion of validity.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Some sections list tools rather than synthesizing evidence about what works, for whom, and under which conditions.
4. Implementation elements (PD time, costs, infrastructure, governance) are noted but not turned into actionable steps.
5. Lacks a scheme to classify evidence strength or to map findings across outcomes and populations.