



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Student Perceptions of an AI-Enhanced Virtual Reality University Office Environment: An Observation-Based Empirical Study”

Submitted: 15 June 2026

Accepted: 17 July 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Amra Abazi Feta

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n24p16

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: İbrahim Çankaya
Education Faculty Uşak University, Turkey

Reviewer 2: Tarek Hegazy
Egyptian E-Learning University (EELU), Egypt

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

General Evaluation

The manuscript addresses a timely and relevant topic by investigating students' perceptions of AI-enhanced Virtual Reality (VR) university office environments. The integration of AI and VR in higher education is an emerging research area, and the manuscript contributes useful preliminary findings. The paper is generally well organized and clearly written. However, several methodological and conceptual issues should be addressed before the manuscript is considered for publication.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

1. Research Novelty

Although the manuscript claims novelty, the contribution should be articulated more explicitly. The authors should clearly explain how this study advances previous AI-VR research beyond combining two existing technologies.

2. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The manuscript does not explicitly state research questions or hypotheses.

The inclusion of clearly formulated research questions (or hypotheses if applicable) would strengthen the theoretical framework and improve methodological coherence.

3. Sample Size

The post-session sample consists of only 29 participants, which considerably limits statistical power and generalizability.

The authors should provide a justification (e.g., power analysis) or discuss this limitation in greater depth.

4. AI Trust Construct

Trust in AI is treated superficially.

The authors should explain:

cognitive trust

affective trust

calibration of trust

and discuss why participants trusted AI accuracy but hesitated to rely on it.

5. Limited Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative findings remain largely descriptive.

Including participant quotations, coding examples, coding reliability, and inter-rater agreement would increase credibility.

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

The manuscript contains frequent repetition of terms such as study, research, participants, and AI within close proximity. The wording should be diversified to improve readability and maintain an academic writing style.

Several paragraphs, particularly in the Introduction and Discussion sections, are excessively long and should be divided into shorter, more focused paragraphs to enhance clarity and readability.

Some sentences are predominantly descriptive rather than analytical. The manuscript would benefit from a more critical and interpretive academic style, especially in the Discussion section. There are inconsistencies in verb tense usage, with occasional shifts between the present and past tense. The manuscript should maintain consistent tense usage in accordance with academic writing conventions.

Punctuation, spacing, and citation formatting are not entirely consistent throughout the manuscript. These elements should be standardized to comply with the journal's formatting and style guidelines.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

1. Ethical Considerations

The ethical approval is briefly mentioned.

The manuscript should clarify:

informed consent procedures

anonymity

data storage

participant withdrawal rights

2. Discussion

The Discussion section occasionally repeats the Results instead of critically interpreting them in light of previous literature.

Greater synthesis with existing AI-VR studies is recommended.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

Overall Recommendation

Major Revision

The manuscript addresses an important and emerging topic and demonstrates potential for publication. Nevertheless, significant revisions are required to strengthen the methodological rigor, improve statistical analysis, clarify the theoretical contribution, and provide stronger evidence supporting the conclusions.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is generally consistent with the reported findings. However, several statements appear broader than the evidence presented in the study. The authors should ensure that all conclusions are directly supported by the reported results and avoid overgeneralization.

The conclusion occasionally repeats the results rather than synthesizing their theoretical and practical implications. Greater emphasis on the significance of the findings is recommended.

The limitations of the study should be more explicitly acknowledged within the conclusion to provide a balanced interpretation of the findings.

The conclusion would be strengthened by highlighting the study's unique contribution to the existing literature and providing more specific recommendations for future research. Some claims regarding the potential impact of AI-enhanced VR environments should be presented more cautiously, considering the relatively small sample size and the observational nature of the study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is generally relevant to the topic and includes a number of recent publications on Artificial Intelligence, Virtual Reality, and higher education. However, it does not appear to be fully comprehensive and could be strengthened to meet the standards of a high-impact international journal.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Recommendation: Major Revision

The manuscript presents a relevant and promising contribution to the field of AI-enhanced virtual learning environments. Nevertheless, substantial revisions are required to strengthen the theoretical foundation, methodological rigor, statistical analysis, and academic presentation before the manuscript is suitable for publication in a high-impact international journal.
