Chatbots as Classroom Assistants: A Qualitative Study on Teachers' Perspectives

Ali Asghar. Mashinchi[1*]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Lamard Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lamard, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mashinch56@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Gholamreza Shams Department of Education, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. gh_shams@sbu.ac.ir	**Reviewer 1:** Leila Talebzade Shoshtari Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Birjand University, Birjand, Iran. Email: l.talebzade@birjand.ac.ir **Reviewer 2:** Fahimeh Abasi Department of Educational Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: abbasi.fahimeh@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The section on technological integration would benefit from a more detailed discussion on how chatbots can be integrated with existing educational technologies. Offering examples or case studies could provide practical insights for educators.

Although the study presents a comprehensive review, integrating more recent studies or contrasting viewpoints might enrich the context. Specifically, exploring studies that have shown limitations or negative outcomes of chatbot integration could provide a balanced view.

The study outlines several implementation strategies but lacks specific examples or recommendations for overcoming identified challenges. Offering concrete steps or actions taken by successful implementations could guide future integrations.

Further exploration of how these roles change over time with the integration of chatbots would add depth. Incorporating teacher and student reflections after a period of using chatbots could provide valuable insights into the long-term effects and adaptations required.

Minor grammatical and typographical errors should be corrected to improve readability. Additionally, simplifying complex sentences could make the article more accessible to a broader audience.

The conclusion briefly mentions future research areas. Expanding this section to suggest specific research questions or methodologies could be beneficial for the academic community interested in exploring chatbot integration further.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The abstract provides a solid overview but could better highlight the study's unique contributions to the field. Specifically, emphasize the diversity of educational levels surveyed and the qualitative approach's depth.

The introduction sets a strong foundation but could further articulate the gap in the literature that this study addresses. Clarifying how this research fills specific knowledge gaps could strengthen its positioning.

More detail on the thematic analysis process would add transparency to the research process. Discussing the rationale behind theme selection and how they emerged from the data could enhance methodological clarity.

While the benefits are well-discussed, integrating comparative analysis with other educational technologies could offer a more nuanced understanding of chatbots' unique advantages and limitations.

The challenges section would benefit from a deeper dive into possible solutions or workarounds for the technical issues highlighted. This would provide a more balanced view of overcoming obstacles in chatbot integration.

Given the emphasis on the need for professional development, suggesting specific content or formats for such programs could offer actionable insights for educators and administrators.

Expanding the discussion on the broader implications of chatbot integration in education to include societal and ethical considerations could provide a more comprehensive overview of the topic.

Strengthening the concluding section with a succinct summary of key findings and their practical implications for educators, policymakers, and technology developers would be beneficial.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.