



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Rethinking Language Education After Crisis: AI-Driven Learning Analytics as a Site of Social Science Inquiry”

Submitted: 10 April 2026

Accepted: 02 July 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Nurdan Kavakli Ulutas

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n20p98

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Francesca Ghirardi
University of Brescia, Italy

Reviewer 2: Rechie C. Bejasa
Department of Education-Region 7, Philippines

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: Rechie C. Bejasa	
University, Country: Department of Education-Region 7/Philippines	
Date Manuscript Received: April 16, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: April 21, 2026
Manuscript Title: Rethinking Language Education After Crisis: AI-Driven Learning Analytics as a Site of Social Science Inquiry	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0465/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear, precise, and accurately reflects the scope of the manuscript. It effectively signals the post-crisis context, the focus on AI-driven learning analytics, and the social science perspective. The phrasing is scholarly and appropriately framed for an interdisciplinary audience.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly presents the purpose and conceptual intent of the article, outlines the analytical dimensions explored, and highlights the implications for research, practice, and policy. However, as this is a conceptual paper, the abstract could more explicitly note that no empirical methods or data analysis were employed, to avoid ambiguity for readers expecting empirical findings.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> ✗ “They depend on the collection, storage, and processing of personal information about learners that is the information that may include...” ✓ Fix: “...information about learners that may include...” ✗ “When algorithmic systems take on functions previously exercised by human educators in terms of diagnosing difficulty...” ✓ Fix: “...such as diagnosing difficulty...” ✗ “In post-crisis settings, language skills in terms of whether in a national language...” ✓ Fix: “In post-crisis settings, language skills whether in a national language...” ✗ “This article, henceforth, states that...” ✓ Fix: “This article argues that...”	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The selection of critical data studies, sociolinguistics, and post-crisis education theory is well supported and appropriately justified. However, the paper could be strengthened by providing a clearer statement at the outset that explicitly identifies the study as a conceptual or theoretical inquiry.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> As a conceptual article, the “results” take the form of analytical claims and synthesized arguments rather than empirical findings. These claims are logically developed, well-supported by the literature, and internally consistent. However, the discussion could be further	

strengthened by incorporating more recent studies (e.g., from the past five years) to reinforce the relevance and timeliness of the arguments. Additionally, a more consolidated summary of the main analytical contributions near the end of the discussion section would help enhance clarity and emphasize the paper's key insights.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions accurately reflect the arguments developed throughout the manuscript and are strongly grounded in the preceding analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The reference list is extensive, current, and highly relevant, showing strong engagement with key literature in learning analytics, critical data studies, sociolinguistics, and AI ethics. Sources are well integrated and properly cited. However, adding more recent studies (within the past five years) may further strengthen the paper by improving its timeliness and relevance.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript offers a strong, timely, and well-theorized contribution to AI-driven learning analytics in language education. The conceptual framing and integration of social science perspectives are clear and original. To improve the paper, the authors should (1) clearly state early that it is a conceptual/theoretical study, (2) simplify some lengthy sentences for readability, (3) add a brief concluding summary of key analytical contributions, and (4) incorporate more recent studies (within the past five years) to further strengthen the discussion and enhance its relevance to current developments in AI and education. These minor revisions would make the paper suitable for publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: