ISSN: 2320-5407

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55304**

Title: INTELLIGENT AGENTS FOR FEEDBACK IN UNIVERSITY PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

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. Touseef Malik**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

This manuscript presents a relevant design-science artifact for formative feedback in university practicum settings and reports promising efficiency and writing-quality improvements. The mixed-methods triangulation is a clear strength, and the outcomes are communicated in operational terms meaningful to tutors and students. However, the evaluation needs stronger methodological transparency (rubrics, scoring procedures, reliability) and a more defensible impact claim given the absence of a control group and the small sample.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths

1. The paper addresses a concrete instructional bottleneck in pedagogical practicum courses—feedback delays, report quality, and tutor workload—and positions the artifact as a targeted solution.
2. The Design Science Research (DSR) framing is appropriate for an artifact-building study and is described as an iterative process with defined phases from objective definition through evaluation and communication.
3. The AVI artifact is clearly characterized (intelligent agents + NLP for automated feedback on practice reports), making the intervention understandable and replicable at a conceptual level.

ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. The study uses triangulated data sources (interviews, observation, documentary analysis, focus groups) alongside quantitative indicators, which strengthens credibility for a mixed-methods evaluation.
5. Results are reported with practical, interpretable indicators (e.g., reduced review time; improvements in writing clarity scores; higher tutor satisfaction), connecting outcomes to educational utility.

Weaknesses

1. The sample is small (12 student teachers and 2 tutors in a single course context), limiting generalizability and increasing sensitivity to cohort effects.
2. There is no comparison/control condition, so improvements could reflect maturation, increased familiarity with report writing, or other concurrent supports rather than the artifact alone.
3. Key measurement details are under-specified: the "textual quality rubrics," scoring procedures, and any reliability checks are not sufficiently documented to evaluate the robustness of the reported gains.
4. The technical description remains high-level: the NLP/semantic precision evaluation criteria, model behavior limits, and error-handling (e.g., hallucination risk) are not detailed, which is important for an AI feedback tool.
5. The manuscript presentation is not publication-ready in places (e.g., placeholder submission/acceptance dates; limited methodological granularity), and would benefit from stronger academic reporting discipline.