

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59142

Title: AI, Technology, and the Future of Language Studies: Opportunities, Challenges, and Transformations.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality				X
Techn. Quality			X	
Clarity		X		
Significance			X	

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Assessment:

This manuscript addresses a highly topical and potentially significant subject: the role of Artificial Intelligence in transforming language studies, with a particular focus on English language learning in Indian educational contexts. The paper's stated aim is to examine the opportunities, challenges, and transformations brought about by AI in language education. However, despite the relevance of the topic, the manuscript suffers from fundamental weaknesses that prevent it from meeting the standards of a scholarly publication. The most critical issues are: an extremely underdeveloped argument, a lack of original research or analysis, an insufficiently rigorous methodology, a superficial engagement with the existing literature, and significant formatting and presentation problems. The paper reads more like a preliminary proposal or an abstract for a paper yet to be written, rather than a completed research article. The recommendation is Accept after major revision.

Major Issues:

1. Lack of Original Contribution and Superficial Analysis:

- The manuscript does not present original research. It is a very brief review of existing literature, but even as a review, it is superficial and does not synthesize or critically evaluate the literature. The findings and discussion sections are extremely short and make broad, generalized statements without providing evidence, examples, or detailed analysis.
- The paper claims to "examine the role of AI in English language learning, particularly in Indian educational contexts" (Abstract), but there is virtually no specific analysis of the Indian context. The paper does not engage with the unique challenges, opportunities, or policies related to AI in Indian education. This is a significant gap given the stated focus.
- The analysis is largely descriptive and does not move beyond common-sense observations (e.g., "AI-powered translation tools have improved cross-cultural communication"). There is no critical engagement with the complexities, contradictions, or ethical dilemmas of AI in language education.

2. Inadequate Methodology:

- The methodology section describes a "qualitative and analytical methodology" based on a "critical review of existing literature." However, the section is vague and does not describe the review process in sufficient detail. What databases were searched? What keywords were used? What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria? How many sources were reviewed? How was the thematic analysis conducted?

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The author cites Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis but does not explain how this method was applied. There is no coding framework, no discussion of how themes were identified or refined, and no presentation of the thematic structure.
- The claim of an "interdisciplinary approach" is not substantiated. The paper does not demonstrate a rigorous engagement with the disciplines of linguistics, literature, technology, and ethics. The discussion of ethics, in particular, is superficial.
- 3. **Superficial Engagement with Literature:**
 - The literature review is extremely brief and does not engage with the substantial body of existing scholarship on AI in language learning. The references are limited and include several web-based sources of varying quality (e.g., blog posts, institutional reports) rather than a robust selection of peer-reviewed academic literature.
 - Key scholars and seminal works in the field (e.g., Godwin-Jones, Kohnke et al., and others in CALL and AI-mediated language learning) are cited but not discussed in any depth. The paper does not position itself within the existing scholarly conversation or identify a clear research gap.
- 4. **Weaknesses in Findings and Discussion:**
 - The "Results" section is only three paragraphs long and presents findings that are either already well-established in the literature or are overly general. For example, the statement that "AI systems often reflect cultural and linguistic biases present in their training data" is a well-known critique that requires more nuanced discussion and specific examples.
 - The "Discussion" section is similarly brief and does not adequately address the implications of the findings. The discussion of ethical and cultural concerns is superficial and does not engage with the complex debates around AI bias, data privacy, linguistic diversity, or the digital divide.
 - The conclusion is a restatement of the introduction and does not offer new insights or directions for future research.
- 5. **Significant Formatting and Presentation Issues:**
 - The manuscript is extremely short. A typical journal article would be substantially longer and would include a more developed literature review, methodology, findings, and discussion.
 - The structure of the paper is unconventional. The "Methods and Methodology" section is placed before the "Results" and "Discussion," which is standard, but the sections are underdeveloped.
 - The reference list is incomplete and inconsistently formatted. Several references cited in the text do not appear in the reference list, and the reference list includes URLs without proper citation information. The references to Godwin-Jones and Kohnke et al. are incomplete (no page numbers, no volume/issue for Godwin-Jones).
 - The abstract makes claims about the study that are not supported by the content of the paper. For example, the abstract states that the study is "supplemented by insights from students and teachers," but there is no evidence of any data collection from students or teachers in the methodology.

Minor Issues:

- The title is broad and does not clearly indicate the specific focus of the paper.
- The keywords are appropriate but could be more specific.
- The introduction provides a general overview of AI and language but does not clearly state the research problem, objectives, or research questions.
- The paper does not include a clear "Literature Review" section; the discussion of literature is scattered throughout the introduction and methodology.

Specific Comments for the Authors (if resubmitted):

Should the author(s) wish to resubmit this manuscript, the following major revisions would be required:

1. **Conduct Original Research or a Comprehensive Review:** The paper must present either original empirical research or a rigorous, systematic review of the literature. A superficial overview is not sufficient for a scholarly publication.
2. **Strengthen the Methodology:** Provide a detailed account of the research design, data collection, and data analysis procedures. If the study is a literature review, describe the search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and analytical framework in detail.
3. **Deepen the Analysis:** Move beyond description to critical analysis. Engage with the complexities, debates, and contradictions in the field. Provide specific examples and evidence to support claims.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Focus on the Indian Context:** If the paper claims to focus on India, it must provide substantive analysis of the Indian educational context, including policies, challenges, and opportunities specific to India.
5. **Engage with the Literature:** Conduct a more thorough review of peer-reviewed academic literature. Position the paper within the existing scholarly conversation and identify a clear research gap.
6. **Improve the Structure and Presentation:** Expand the manuscript significantly. Ensure that all sections are fully developed. Follow a consistent citation style. Provide a complete and properly formatted reference list.
7. **Ensure Consistency Between Abstract and Content:** The abstract should accurately reflect the content of the paper. Do not claim to have collected data from students and teachers if such data collection was not conducted.

Conclusion:

This manuscript addresses a relevant and timely topic but is fundamentally underdeveloped and does not meet the standards of a scholarly publication. The lack of original research, the superficial engagement with the literature, the inadequate methodology, and the numerous formatting issues are significant barriers to publication. A major revision or complete rewrite would be required for this manuscript to be considered for publication. The recommendation is for major revision