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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, because it explores the innovative application of AI in enhancing quality assurance processes within higher education, particularly in Southern Africa. It is also contributing to the growing body of knowledge on how AI technologies can be leveraged to improve operational efficiency, curriculum development as well as educational outcomes. By integrating theoretical frameworks with practical implications, the manuscript offers valuable insights for educators, policymakers and even to the institutions that are looking to modernize and optimize their quality assurance systems. There is also pertinent discussions on ethical considerations, which is crucial in the responsible deployment of AI in the education field. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title of the manuscript, **"Redefining higher education quality assurance through the infusion of artificial intelligence into its systems"** is suitable, as it accurately reflects the content. Yet, I suggest adding "Southern Africa" to the title to narrow down the focus, aligning it with the regional emphasis within the chapter. So, a potential title could be**: "Redefining Higher Education Quality Assurance in Southern Africa through the Infusion of Artificial Intelligence”** |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the chapter. Still, it can be enhanced by clearly stating the regional focus (Southern Africa). Author(s) shall add more details about the methodologies and specific examples of the impact of AI on quality assurance in higher education. This will improve the precision and clarity of the Abstract. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The manuscript is scientifically correct and it covers important aspects of AI integration in higher education. Theoretical frameworks such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Diffusion of Innovation theory are appropriately applied. Author(s) can add more empirical data or case studies to support the theoretical arguments. Real-life examples can be included, especially from Southern African institutions, which strengthens the manuscript. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are sufficient, as it includes a mix of recent and relevant literature. There is a good balance between theoretical sources and applied research. Some references seem to be outdated, especially those related to AI developments that are evolving rapidly. Author(s) can include more recent references from 2024 or the latest AI reports to maintain up-to-date relevance. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is clear and scholarly. Still, there are occasional grammatical issues and mistakes in phrasing. **For example:** In the introduction, phrases like " in incites to the development of a quality assurance system" shall be rephrased for smoother readability. A careful proofreading and language review is recommended for overall clarity. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript is fine. It could be made more relevant by additional case studies, empirical evidence and a stronger focus on AI ethics.  |  |
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