Corresponding Author: Rami Mubarak

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Revise for clarity and correct the privacy terminology error. The abstract mentions "privacy benefits," which appears to be an error (should be "privacy concerns"). • The title clearly indicates the study's focus, population, and context.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The authors should consider the following:
Revise the participant description for grammatical clarity. Explicitly state the male-only limitation. Correct "privacy benefits" to "privacy concerns"
Consider adding one sentence about the awareness-usage gap (high awareness, low regular use).
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Grammar and vocabulary checking are required. For instance, the mother tongue effect on vocabulary selection is obvious (e.g, Error: "assumed" is an incorrect verb, which should be "The research employed/adopted/used a quantitative descriptive research design"). Unnecessary articles "greatly enhance syntactic accuracy and lexical diversity".
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Statistical issues in the paper:
1. Statistical Analysis: Only descriptive statistics are reported. Given the research questions, inferential statistics (correlations, chi-square tests, ANOVA) would strengthen findings.
2. TAM Application: The study claims to use TAM but doesn't actually measure or test the TAM constructs statistically. The six perception items don't clearly map onto TAM's core constructs (perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, attitude, behavioral intention).
3. Reliability: Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.75$ is borderline acceptable. With only six items, this suggests some inconsistency in the scale.
4. Missing Data: No discussion of how missing data was handled or whether all 68 participants answered all questions.
5. Effect Sizes: No reporting of effect sizes or practical significance, only statistical descriptions.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
In the discussion section, some interpretations extend beyond what the data can support (e.g., claims about a "transitional phase of adoption" based on cross-sectional data). The discussion of TAM findings is superficial—no actual testing of TAM relationships was conducted. Limited critical reflection on contradictory findings (high awareness but low usage). Thus, a thorough revision is recommended for the body section.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
This study makes a timely contribution to understanding Saudi EFL learners' engagement with AI-powered language learning platforms within the Vision 2030 framework. The research addresses a relevant gap by focusing on students' direct experiences rather than institutional or educator perspectives. However, several methodological limitations and presentation issues diminish the study's overall impact and generalizability.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Several important works mentioned in the text are not included in the reference list:

Davis (1989) - Technology Acceptance Model (cited multiple times in text)

Vygotsky (1978) - Zone of Proximal Development (cited in theoretical framework)

Allen and Mizumoto (2024) - Mentioned in discussion section but absent from references

Alqaed (2024) appears to be cited twice with different contexts, suggesting possible multiple works or citation errors.

Several references lack essential details:

Alharthi (2024): No journal name, volume, pages, or DOI—appears incomplete

Altamimi (2025): No publication venue information

Jamshed et al. (2025): Listed as 2025 but study was conducted in October 2024—temporal inconsistency

No citations for:

Survey design and validation procedures

Cronbach's alpha interpretation standards

Quantitative descriptive research methodology

Ethical research guidelines

The reference list is inadequate for a scholarly research article. It lacks theoretical depth, methodological grounding, and international perspectives essential for situating this study within the broader CALL and AI literature.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

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: Heba Mostafa Mohamed	
University/Country: Beni Suef	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Exploring Saudi EFL Learners' Perceptions and Use of AI-Powered English Language Learning Platforms in the Context of Vision 2030**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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:	

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.	4
The title is well formed and adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is well-written as it presents the research's purpose , its participants, methods and results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
No grammatical mistakes are found.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The research method is clearly explained	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
No errors in results	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are accurate .	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

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):

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: Sahar Abboud Alameh	
University/Country: Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: November, 14,2025	Date Review Report Submitted: November, 21,2025
Manuscript Title: **Exploring Saudi EFL Learners' Perceptions and Use of AI-Powered English Language Learning Platforms in the Context of Vision 2030**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1161/25	
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: yes 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**

Perhaps reconsider the title, as the word "perceptions" implies much more than the quantitative scope of the study. Combining "perceptions" and "use" in a title often signals the researcher's intent to measure the "use" broadly (quantitatively) and explain it deeply (qualitatively).

You can also specify the type of the learners in the title: undergraduate EFL learners

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3

Needs revision based on your title to incorporate qualitative data.

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

Needs major revision to improve accuracy and clarity. Below are some revised sections, for example, refer to :

Abstract on page:2

Revised Sample: "This study discusses how Saudi EFL undergraduate students perceive and utilize AI-based learning tools in English language classes, drawing on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Saudi Vision 2030…..As the results have shown, the level of awareness of AI tools was very high (83.8%), with the most commonly used platforms being (or including) ChatGPT, Duolingo, and Grammarly… Overall, the results demonstrate a balanced optimism and propose institutional policies, ethical education, and AI literacy to facilitate the successful implementation of AI in Saudi higher education."

Refer to the section highlighted in red on page 6:

Revised sample:…… that some constant limitations in the Arabic natural language processing (NLP) sometimes made erroneous interpretations…

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

➢ Brief the process that you followed to construct this questionnaire via a visual with a brief description.
➢ To which schools (engineering, pharmacy, education,…) participants in this study belong? Do you think that their perceptions were affected by the needs of the course material or the major?
➢ Add the questionnaire in the appendix.
➢ You can enhance the content validity of the questionnaire by briefly highlighting:

• what the experts evaluated (clarity, relevance, alignment with objectives),
• that revisions were based on their feedback,
• what the pilot confirmed.

➢ On page 9, under the title of ethical considerations, you stated "Based on the wording you provided, the study cannot be described as purely quantitative, even though it *begins* by calling itself a "quantitative descriptive study."

➢ Based on the wording you provided in the last paragraph of the ethical considerations, "…. descriptive statistics and thematic analysis would provide a solid foundation for the subsequent results…" the study cannot be described as purely quantitative, even though it begins by calling itself a "quantitative descriptive study. Including thematic analysis, in the last paragraph of the ethical considerations, is strictly qualitative and involves coding open-ended responses or textual data.

➢ You also mentioned on page: 9 under the title " Data Analysis" the following:

"The thematic approach to open-ended responses was performed to identify the issues that can emerge frequently, including accessibility, excessive automation, data privacy, and motivation. Qualitative insights were used to complement quantitative findings in order to come up with a comprehensive understanding"

The above implies that the study cannot be described as purely quantitative. In your study, it is clear that the research design employed a mixed-methods descriptive approach, combining quantitative questionnaire data with qualitative thematic analysis (that was not thoroughly discussed in this article).

Is this manuscript part of a larger research project? If so, you could make that explicit, especially since you mention the qualitative thematic analysis without providing further context.

➢ In what way did you evaluate the homogeneity of the participants, and which specific factors or characteristics were considered in this assessment?

➢ The inclusion of a visual diagram or flowchart outlining the procedural steps would have significantly enhanced clarity and replicability. While the narrative description is adequate, a visual representation could help readers better understand the sequencing and structure of the intervention.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3

Needs major revision:

To be clear and concise, correlate between results shown in the bar graphs, pie charts, line graphs, the research questions, and the interpretation. This will help you ensure the validity, clarity, and effectiveness of your results.

To what extent can these outcomes be applied to other contexts?	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
Brief the main aspects of vision 2030 to match it with the results and the aim of your study. To what extent can these outcomes be applied to other contexts?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
You need to add the full reference for Davis (1989) and Vygotsky (1978), presented in the literature review, in the bibliography	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Review your paper to make it align with apa 7th edition style (for example line spacing, justify paragraphs…,etc,…

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: