

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59551

Title: Rewriting the Addiction Narrative through Artificial Intelligence in the Prediction, Screening, and Treatment of Substance Use Disorders and Behavioural Addiction.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ...yes.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-Dr.Shaweta Sachdeva

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The search strategy is insufficiently detailed to ensure reproducibility. The authors should provide complete search strings, search dates, and the rationale for selecting the databases.
2. The search period is reported as 1 January 2015 to 31 February 2026. The authors should correct the end date and specify the actual date of the final search.
3. The PRISMA flow diagram requires clarification, as the numbers and reasons for exclusion at different stages should be presented consistently and transparently.
4. The authors should provide a comprehensive table summarizing the included studies, including study design, sample size, population, AI techniques, outcomes, and key findings.
5. The quality assessment methodology is inadequately described. The authors should specify the assessment tools used, the evaluation criteria, and the procedure followed to resolve disagreements between reviewers.
6. The manuscript groups machine learning models, chatbots, mobile health applications, and digital therapeutics together. The authors should distinguish AI-based interventions from conventional digital health technologies.
7. The literature review is largely descriptive and lacks critical comparison across studies. The authors should synthesize the findings, highlight contradictory results, and identify important gaps in the existing evidence.
8. The authors should provide more information on model performance, including sensitivity, specificity, calibration, external validation, and generalizability, wherever these data are available.
9. The manuscript should distinguish predictive performance from demonstrated clinical effectiveness. High model accuracy alone does not establish that an AI intervention improves treatment outcomes or prevents relapse.
10. The diagnostic status of the behavioural addictions discussed requires clarification. The authors should avoid treating gambling disorder, gaming-related problems, compulsive buying, and excessive social media use as diagnostically equivalent conditions.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

11. The discussion of ethical concerns should be expanded to address algorithmic bias, informed consent, confidentiality, transparency, accountability, and the potential consequences of inaccurate risk predictions.
12. The authors should provide a separate discussion of the limitations of the review, including database selection, language restrictions, possible publication bias, and heterogeneity among the included studies.
13. The abstract should clearly report the number of studies included, the principal findings, and the major limitations of the available evidence.
14. The Introduction contains extensive background information and would benefit from streamlining. The authors should clearly identify the research gap and state the specific objectives of the review.
15. The inclusion of DSM-IV-TR diagnostic criteria requires justification. The authors should clarify the relevance of these historical criteria to the review and ensure consistency in diagnostic terminology.
16. There is considerable repetition between the literature review and Discussion sections. The authors should reduce redundancy and organize the findings into clearly defined thematic areas.
17. The references and in-text citations should be carefully cross-checked for accuracy, completeness, consistency, and correspondence with the original publications.
18. Several statements regarding the benefits of AI appear overly generalized. The authors should ensure that the conclusions are proportionate to the strength and quality of the available evidence.
19. Abbreviations, technical terminology, and spelling conventions should be standardized throughout the manuscript.
20. The manuscript requires comprehensive language editing to address grammatical errors, awkward sentence construction, inconsistent spacing, and typographical mistakes.