REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55711

Title: L INNOVATION PEDAGOGIQUE : Quand l innovation transforme l enseignement.

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: Shafiya Akhter

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript examines pedagogical innovation in the context of artificial intelligence and contemporary educational transformation. The topic is **highly relevant and timely**, especially in light of the rapid integration of AI technologies into teaching and learning processes during the fourth industrial revolution. The paper provides a comprehensive theoretical overview grounded in educational theories, digital pedagogy, and recent scientific literature.

Strengths

1. **Topical relevance and significance:**

   The manuscript addresses an important global issue—how artificial intelligence reshapes pedagogy, learning personalization, and teaching practices—making it highly relevant for educators, researchers, and policymakers.

2. **Strong theoretical foundation:**

   The discussion of learning theories (constructivism, behaviorism, and cognitivism) is detailed and well-articulated, demonstrating a solid understanding of educational theory and its relevance to pedagogical innovation.

3. **Comprehensive literature review:**

   The paper draws on a wide range of recent and relevant academic sources, which strengthens its conceptual grounding.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Clear linkage between AI and pedagogical innovation:**

   The manuscript effectively explains how AI contributes to personalized learning, adaptive teaching, automation of educational tasks, and the creation of interactive learning environments.

5. **Structured organization:**

   The article follows a logical structure, progressing from conceptual foundations to applications of AI in education.

Areas Requiring Minor Revision

1. **Language and clarity:**
   o While the manuscript is generally well-written, some sentences are lengthy and dense.
   o Minor grammatical, typographical, and stylistic revisions are needed to improve readability and academic clarity.

2. **Abstract refinement:**
   o The abstract could be more concise and clearly highlight the methodology, key findings, and main conclusions of the study.

3. **Balance between description and critical analysis:**
   o The manuscript is largely descriptive. A deeper critical analysis of the limitations, risks, and challenges of AI in education—particularly ethical concerns, data privacy, and inequality of access—would strengthen the paper.

4. **Completion and coherence:**
   o The manuscript appears to be incomplete toward the end of section 2.3. The remaining discussion, conclusion, and recommendations should be fully developed.
   o Clear concluding remarks summarizing key insights and future research directions are recommended.

5. **Methodological clarity:**
   o Although the study is based on a literature review, the methodology section could be strengthened by briefly explaining the criteria for selecting sources.

6. **Consistency in referencing:**
   o Citations should be standardized according to a single academic referencing style.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Conclusion of the Reviewer

The manuscript makes a **valuable contribution** to the discussion on pedagogical innovation and the role of artificial intelligence in education. It is theoretically sound and addresses a topic of significant contemporary importance. However, **minor revisions** are necessary to improve clarity, analytical depth, and completeness of the paper.