






Leveraging AI-Powered Writing Assistants to Enhance L2 Writing Proficiency: A Mixed-Methods Study

Reza. Khany¹, Pooria. Barzan^{2*}

¹ Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran

² Department of English Language and Literature, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: pooriabarzan@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
<p>Leila Youzbashi Department of sport science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran l.youzbashi@znu.ac.ir</p>	<p>Reviewer 1: Masoud Mirmoezi Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com Reviewer 2: Kamdin Parsakia Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca</p>

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Provide recent empirical references (post-2020) to support the claim about the limitations of teacher-centered feedback, as current literature on hybrid feedback models could strengthen this argument.

This is an important concern but remains underdeveloped. Consider elaborating on how metacognitive skill deficits manifest in writing tasks (e.g., error detection, revision planning).

Specify how these analytics have been validated as reliable proxies of engagement, citing methodological papers (e.g., Liu, M. et al., 2015).

This is a critical equity issue. Suggest including global statistics or data from similar EFL contexts to illustrate the scale of the digital divide.

There is a contradiction between purposive sampling and later mentioning stratified randomization. Clarify the sampling strategy to avoid confusion.

Include details on what this training entailed and how fidelity of implementation was ensured (e.g., attendance, post-training quiz).

Mention the training procedures for raters and whether they were blinded to group allocation to reduce potential bias.

Expand on other trustworthiness strategies (e.g., triangulation, peer debriefing). This will strengthen the credibility of qualitative findings.

The description of Figure 1 is narrative but lacks statistical interpretation (e.g., error bars, significance levels). Include these to support claims.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Add explicit citations to studies with these methodological limitations to reinforce this claim. Without specific examples, the critique appears anecdotal.

Specify how “intermediate to advanced” proficiency was defined and verified (e.g., exact CEFR bands, test scores). This will enhance transparency.

Consider integrating findings from meta-analyses on peer feedback effectiveness to provide a more comprehensive overview and balance the critical tone.

Expand briefly on the scope of feedback Grammarly offers (e.g., cohesion, tone, clarity). This would contextualize its relevance to higher-order writing skills.

Report assumptions checked for regression (normality, multicollinearity, homoscedasticity) to ensure the robustness of these findings.

Suggest also discussing the limitations of Grammarly’s algorithm (e.g., potential bias, lack of genre awareness) to better contextualize generalizability.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.