

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-58905**

Title: Artificial Intelligence and Assistive Technologies for Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Education: A PRISMA-Guided Systematic Review.

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's ID: JPR- **098**

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Decision: Accept after Major Revision

Major Revisions

1. Clarify the systematic-review methodology and PRISMA compliance.

The authors should provide a complete and transparent description of the PRISMA-guided search, screening, eligibility, and inclusion procedures. The PRISMA flow diagram should clearly report the number of records identified, duplicates removed, records screened, full texts assessed, exclusions with reasons, and studies finally included.

2. Strengthen the database search strategy.

The authors should provide the complete search strings used for each database, together with the search dates, database coverage, and relevant Boolean operators. Reliance on a limited number of databases may result in omission of important studies in education, disability, and technology research.

3. Provide stronger justification for the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

The manuscript should clearly define the population, intervention/technology, educational setting, study design, publication type, language, and outcome criteria used for study selection. The rationale for excluding particular studies should also be transparent.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Improve the quality assessment of the included studies.

A systematic review should critically evaluate the methodological quality or risk of bias of the included studies. The authors should identify the appraisal tool(s) used, explain how studies were assessed, and incorporate study quality into the interpretation of the findings.

5. Strengthen the synthesis of evidence across disability categories.

Students with disabilities represent highly heterogeneous populations. The review should provide a clearer comparison of how AI and assistive technologies address different disability groups, such as visual, hearing, physical, learning, communication, and cognitive disabilities, rather than presenting them collectively.

6. Distinguish assistive technologies from AI-enabled technologies more precisely.

The manuscript should establish a clear conceptual distinction between conventional assistive technologies and AI-based/adaptive technologies. Technologies such as adaptive learning systems, generative AI, predictive systems, speech recognition, computer vision, and intelligent personalization should be systematically categorized.

7. Strengthen the analysis of actual educational outcomes.

The review should distinguish between studies reporting perceptions, acceptance, usability, or intention to use and studies demonstrating measurable improvements in accessibility, participation, learning achievement, independence, or educational attainment. Conclusions about effectiveness should be based primarily on outcome evidence rather than adoption or perception studies.

8. Provide a more critical analysis of ethical and accessibility risks.

Privacy, algorithmic bias, fairness, transparency, data protection, accessibility, human oversight, and learner autonomy should be analyzed critically rather than presented only as general concerns. The review should also consider whether AI technologies may unintentionally increase inequalities among students with disabilities.

9. Strengthen the geographical and contextual analysis.

The authors should examine whether the evidence is concentrated in particular countries or educational systems. Differences in infrastructure, socioeconomic conditions, teacher training, accessibility standards, and technological availability may substantially influence the effectiveness and feasibility of AI-based assistive technologies.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

10. **Moderate and strengthen the conclusions according to the available evidence.**

The conclusions should clearly distinguish established evidence from emerging or speculative benefits. The authors should avoid implying that AI universally improves inclusive education and should identify the conditions under which AI and assistive technologies are most likely to produce sustainable educational benefits. Specific future research priorities, including longitudinal, experimental, and real-world intervention studies, should also be clearly stated.

Minor Revision

1. **Improve the grammatical and linguistic consistency** throughout the manuscript. Several sentences can be shortened or restructured to improve readability and academic clarity.
2. **Standardize terminology** used for students with disabilities, inclusive education, artificial intelligence, and assistive technologies throughout the manuscript.
3. **Ensure consistency in abbreviations.** Terms such as **AI, AT, PRISMA**, and other abbreviations should be defined at their first occurrence and used consistently thereafter.
4. **Improve the presentation of tables.** Table headings, column alignment, font size, spacing, and terminology should be standardized to improve readability.
5. **Improve the PRISMA flow diagram.** The figure should be clearly labeled, legible, and consistent with the numbers reported in the methodology and results sections.
6. **Strengthen figure and table captions.** Captions should be sufficiently descriptive so that each figure or table can be understood without referring extensively to the main text.
7. **Check consistency between in-text citations and the reference list.** Every cited study should appear in the reference list, and all listed references should be appropriately cited in the manuscript.
8. **Update and verify the reference formatting.** The references should follow the journal's prescribed style consistently, including author names, publication year, journal title, volume, pages, and DOI information where applicable.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

9. **Reduce repetition in the discussion and conclusion sections.** Several findings and implications can be presented more concisely without losing their scientific meaning.
10. **Perform a final editorial and formatting check.** The manuscript should be carefully reviewed for typographical errors, punctuation, spacing, heading levels, capitalization, table/figure numbering, and consistency of formatting before resubmission.