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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is timely and relevant, especially in the era where artificial intelligence tools become more widespread in language classrooms. It addresses the urgent need to compare human and AI-generated corrective feedback in the EFL context, which is an under-researched area. The study provide empirical evidence that AI feedback can be more effective than traditional feedback in enhancing writing skills, particularly in environments with limited teaching resources. This is an important contribution for researchers and practitioners interested in integrating AI tools into teaching. | This study addresses a timely issue in ELT by comparing AI- and teacher-generated corrective feedback. It provides empirical data in a less-researched area and is particularly relevant for resource-limited educational contexts. The findings can guide teachers and researchers in integrating AI into writing instruction effectively. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title is clear and appropriate. However, it could be improved for more clarity and brevity. Suggested alternative:  “Comparing AI and Teacher Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners’ Essay Writing” | Yes, we changed the title “Comparing AI and Teacher Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners’ Essay Writing Skills” |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract provides a general overview of the study and includes the purpose, method, results, and conclusion. It is mostly comprehensive, but I suggest adding a sentence to clarify the significance of the findings for future teaching practices. Also, the sentence “AI tools can serve as a reliable and efficient alternative in writing instruction” should be followed by limitations or contexts where it may not be effective. | Based on suggestions, a sentence “AI tools can serve as a reliable and efficient alternative in writing instruction” was added to highlight the pedagogical value of the findings and this sentence “However, their effectiveness may vary depending on learners’ proficiency levels, task complexity, and their familiarity with digital tools” to acknowledge the limitations of AI in some contexts. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically valid and presents sound methodology and analysis. Using IELTS-based writing tasks and the 6+1 Traits Writing Rubric is appropriate. Data analysis was done correctly with a t-test and correlation coefficient for inter-rater reliability. However, some parts of the methodology section are repetitive and could be more concise. Also, some procedural steps were described in the future tense, which is better to be in the past tense. | Yes, the study uses valid instruments and sound data analysis. Minor repetitions and future tense issues in the methodology section were revised accordingly. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are sufficient and mostly recent, especially those from 2023–2024, which is appropriate for AI-related studies. Still, a few more references from the Southeast Asian or MENA region would add more contextual richness, particularly about the perception of AI in an educational context. Authors might consider adding more theoretical framing, maybe with reference to feedback literacy or the technology acceptance model (TAM). | As suggested, new sources from Southeast Asia ( Sumakul, 2022) was added in discussion part and a theoretical source on feedback literacy (Emidar et al.,2023) were added in introduction part. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The English is understandable and academic in tone, but there are many grammatical errors and awkward phrases. For example, “students learned how to *received* feedback” should be corrected to “students learned how to receive feedback.” Articles and verb tenses are sometimes inconsistent. Despite this, the meaning is mostly clear. A language editing service or proofreading is recommended before publication. | All grammatical errors and awkward expressions, such as verb tense mistakes, have been corrected during editing. |
| Optional/General comments |  | Thank you for the helpful suggestions. All points have been carefully addressed and highlighted in the revised manuscript. |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | Concerning ethical issues in this manuscript. All participants were informed about the nature and purpose of the study, and their informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. Confidentiality and anonymity were fully maintained throughout the research process. |