**Reviewer 1:**

While the manuscript demonstrates clear structure, topic relevance, and engagement with timely research in AI-integrated education, the reference section does not fully comply with the Journal of Internet Technology (JIT) citation guidelines. Specifically:

1. Several journal names are abbreviated instead of written in full, as required.
2. Multiple conference proceedings are missing essential metadata, such as city, country, and publisher (e.g., IEEE).
3. A number of references use et al., which is not permitted in the reference list. All authors must be listed in full.
4. The title casing of references is inconsistent; JIT requires the use of Title Case for article titles.
5. There is a lack of standardized formatting in terms of volume, issue number, page range, and publication month, especially in references from 2023-2025.
6. In-text citations should also be carefully checked to ensure they appear in ascending numerical order, and that every reference listed is cited in the body of the paper.

**Reviewer 2:**

Please perform a careful content review aimed at trimming 5-10% of narrative redundancy, while enhancing the academic tone and structural coherence of the manuscript. The detailed comments are as follows:

1. The manuscript currently cites Slimi [7], a 2021 non-peer-reviewed source that does not appear to be formally published. JIT requires scholarly, peer-reviewed references; thus, this reference should be replaced with a recent, credible 2024-2025 source on AI in education. You may revise the corresponding paragraph accordingly to reflect the shift in empirical scope and citation validity.
2. According to the JIT author guidelines, the manuscript must not exceed 10 pages (excluding references). Although the current submission is close to this limit, certain sections, particularly Section 5 (Discussion), contain descriptions that are overly detailed and include repetitive phrasing.
3. Several paragraphs throughout the manuscript would benefit from condensation or restructuring. For example:
   * Some definitions in the Introduction can be merged or rewritten more concisely.
   * Table descriptions and figure legends could be tightened to reduce word count without compromising clarity.
   * The Discussion section contains multiple overlapping ideas about engagement and personalization that can be unified.
4. Additionally, language throughout the manuscript can be improved for academic fluency and stylistic consistency. Examples include:
   * Replace informal or redundant phrases like “this paper aims to show that…” with more precise, concise alternatives like “This study investigates…”
   * Ensure all section transitions are logically smooth and avoid abrupt thematic shifts.
5. Some parts of the text would benefit from stronger signposting and thematic cohesion-e.g., linking emotional engagement and AI tools more explicitly when transitioning from Section 4.3 to Section 5.