Paper: **"Integrating Artificial Intelligence to Enhance Writing Proficiency: An Exploratory Study of EFL Students' and Instructors' Perspectives at a University Level in Lebanon"**

Corresponding Author: Nawal Nabih Ayoub

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marinella Lorinczi
University of Cagliari, Italy

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 15/04	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/04
Manuscript Title: **Integrating Artificial Intelligence to Enhance Writing Proficiency: An Exploratory Study of EFL Students' and Instructors' Perspectives at a University Level in Lebanon**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 63.04.25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: no	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: no You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The title is clear but too wordy	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is clear and complete	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The language is accurate	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
A few more references to the different methods would be appreciated. More appropriate section titles are required	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
There are a few relevant inconsistencies: * 1. The demographics should be presented in the context of study*	

2. *The result sections present the raw data but there is no thorough discussion or explicit and extensive reference to the research questions*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The end of the paper is rashed and the reader is left with the feeling that something is missing. They are not walked through the results towards	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author(s),
Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript. The topic you address is timely and relevant, and the methodological approach appears sound and well-executed. However, the manuscript would benefit from substantial revisions before it can be considered for publication. While the presentation of raw data is clear, the paper currently lacks sufficient argumentation and critical discussion. The results are not adequately contextualized within the framework of your stated research questions. To enhance the contribution of your work, it is essential to interpret the findings more thoroughly and explicitly connect them back to the core objectives of your study.
A more robust discussion section—where the implications of the data are explored, limitations are acknowledged, and comparisons to existing literature are made—would significantly strengthen the manuscript and help readers appreciate the value of your research.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Marinella LŐRINCZI	
University/Country: ITALY	
Date Manuscript Received: 30.4. 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 5.5.2025
Manuscript Title: Integrating Artificial Intelligence to Enhance Writing Proficiency: An Exploratory Study of EFL Students' and Instructors' Perspectives at a University Level in Lebanon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0463/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	–
(Please insert your comments) **I AM NOT ABLE TO COMMENT THIS TOPIC**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
(Please insert your comments)	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
THE STUDY OF SUCH A PROBLEM CANNOT EXCLUDE SOME ERRORS	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
THEY ARE APPROPRIATE, BUT MONOLINGUALISM SHOULD BE AVOIDED, GENERALLY SPEAKING, AS WELL AS TOO GENERIC REFERENCES.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed I AM REFERRING TO THE COMMENTS INSERTED IN RED IN THE TEXT	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

MY COMMENTS ARE INSERTED IN RED IN THE TEXT

Similar topics have been discussed, for example here, in Italy, in 2023:
1. https://www.insulaeuropea.eu/2023/07/18/preservare-il-passato-abbracciare-il-futuro-filologia-e-intelligenza-artificiale/
2. https://rosa.uniroma1.it/rosa03/cognitive_philology/issue/view/1666 PROCEEDINGS OF 1.

I recommend the translation and reading of n.1, just to see what happens in other disciplines, and in other languages, not just in English.

For the rest, I wrote comments (also amused ones, others are very serious), in red and with smaller characters, suggestions, things like that, which do not affect the validity and interest of a complicated research. The authors should consider them as thoughts that come to mind to those who read and are linguists. And they have to consider also that in Europe the most complicated orthography is the English one, next comes the Danish.