Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Manuscript Title:

Traditional Writing and E-Writing Using Gen-AI to Empower Students' Critical Thinking in Argumentative Text

Journal:

English Review: Journal of English Education (ERJEE)

Manuscript ID: [235]

Authors:

Dedeh Rohayati, Etika Rachmawati, R. Bunga Febriani, and Bambang Ruby Sugiarto

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We sincerely thank the Editor and the Reviewers for their careful reading of our manuscript and for providing constructive and insightful comments. We greatly appreciate the time and effort invested in reviewing our work. The comments have helped us identify important areas for improvement and have enabled us to strengthen the manuscript substantially.

We have carefully considered all comments and suggestions and have revised the manuscript accordingly. In particular, we have:

1. revised the title and abstract to improve contextual specificity and methodological clarity;
2. updated and substantially expanded the literature review with recent scholarship on Gen-AI, critical thinking, argumentative writing, and human-AI hybrid writing;
3. clarified the research gap, novelty, and significance of the study;
4. expanded the Method section by providing greater detail about the research context, participant selection, observation procedures, document analysis, coding procedures, and trustworthiness;
5. strengthened the Results and Discussion section through more explicit interpretation of the findings, triangulation across data sources, and connections with relevant theoretical frameworks;
6. incorporated recent scholarship to discuss the potential of Gen-AI both to support and to weaken students' critical thinking;
7. strengthened the Conclusion by explicitly presenting the contribution of the study, limitations, future research directions, and pedagogical implications for Indonesian EFL writing;
8. revised the manuscript for grammatical accuracy, clarity, conciseness, and academic style; and
9. substantially revised and standardized the reference list according to APA 7th edition and the journal's requirements.

Following the reviewers' suggestions, we have provided a detailed point-by-point response below. For ease of reference, the reviewers' comments are presented in **bold**, followed by our responses. The exact page and line numbers will correspond to the revised manuscript.

We hope that the revisions have addressed the reviewers' concerns and have substantially strengthened the manuscript.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER A

We sincerely thank Reviewer A for the comprehensive evaluation and constructive suggestions concerning the title, abstract, introduction, literature review, research gap, novelty, significance, and references. We have carefully addressed each point as follows.

Comment A1 – Title

Reviewer **Comment:**

The title is clear and accurately reflects the study's focus. However, it does not specify the educational level or geographical context. The reviewer recommends adding "Indonesian EFL" or "higher education" and suggests the title:

"Traditional Writing and E-Writing Using Gen-AI to Empower Students' Critical Thinking in Argumentative Text: A Case Study in Indonesian EFL Higher Education."

Response:

Thank you for this valuable suggestion. We agree that specifying the educational and contextual setting makes the scope of the study clearer. Accordingly, we have revised the title to explicitly indicate the Indonesian EFL higher education context.

Revision Made:

The title has been revised to:

Traditional Writing and E-Writing Using Gen-AI to Empower Students' Critical Thinking in Argumentative Text: A Case Study in Indonesian EFL Higher Education.

Location: [Page 1, Lines 1-4]

Comment A2 – Abstract: Background

Reviewer Comment:

The background is adequately contextualized but could be more concise.

Response:

Thank you for the suggestion. We have condensed the background section of the abstract by removing repetitive explanations while retaining the essential context concerning Gen-AI, writing, and critical thinking.

Revision Made:

The background statement has been shortened and revised for greater conciseness.

Location: [Page 1, Abstract Lines 1-2]

Comment A3 – Abstract: Methods

Reviewer Comment:

The method is mentioned but insufficiently described. The reviewer recommends specifying the number of participants and the data collection methods more explicitly.

Response:

We appreciate this important observation. We have revised the Methods part of the abstract to explicitly state that the study involved 24 third-year students and used multiple data sources, including classroom observations, students' argumentative writing documents, and semi-structured interviews.

Revision Made:

The abstract now explicitly identifies the number of participants and the principal data collection methods.

Location: [Page 1, Abstract Lines 5-6]

Comment A4 – Abstract: Findings

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Reviewer Comment:
The findings should be more specific, particularly concerning how critical thinking elements improved, such as thesis statement formulation and the inclusion of facts/data.
Response:
Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have revised the findings statement to provide more concrete information about the observed critical thinking elements in students' argumentative writing. In particular, the revised abstract highlights students' development in formulating thesis statements and presenting facts/data and logical arguments.
Revision Made:
The findings section of the abstract has been rewritten to provide more specific evidence of the critical thinking elements identified in the students' writing.
Location: [Page 1, Abstract Lines 12-14]

Comment A5 – Abstract: Students' Awareness
Reviewer **Comment:**
The abstract mentions students' awareness of traditional writing, e-writing, Gen-AI use, argumentative text, and critical thinking, but does not sufficiently explain the level or nature of this awareness.
Response:
We agree that the previous version did not sufficiently clarify the nature of students' awareness. We have revised the abstract to explain that students demonstrated awareness of argumentative text structures and critical thinking elements while also recognizing the complementary roles and limitations of traditional writing, e-writing, and Gen-AI.
Revision Made:
The nature of students' awareness has been clarified in the revised abstract.
Location: [Page 1, Abstract Lines 12-14]

Comment A6 – Abstract: Future Research
Reviewer Comment:
The recommendation for future research should specify the type of interview questions that future studies should investigate.
Response:
Thank you for this suggestion. We have clarified the recommendation for future research by indicating that subsequent studies could investigate students' feelings, contrasting perceptions between traditional writing and e-writing/Gen-AI-assisted writing, and construct-forming processes that may provide deeper insight into students' cognitive and affective experiences.
Revision Made:
The final statement of the abstract has been revised to make the future research directions more specific.
Location: [Page 1, Abstract Lines 14-16]

Comment A7 – Introduction: Outdated References
Reviewer **Comment:**
The introduction relies on several older sources, including Brown (2000), Galbraith and Baaijen (2018), and Limpo and Graham (2020). These should be supplemented with recent research from 2023–2026.
Response:
We appreciate this important observation. We agree that foundational sources remain useful for establishing theoretical concepts, but current discussions of writing pedagogy and Gen-AI require engagement with more recent scholarship. Therefore, we have retained selected

foundational references where conceptually necessary while substantially adding recent studies published between 2023 and 2026.

Revision Made:

Recent scholarship concerning EFL writing pedagogy, Gen-AI-assisted writing, critical thinking, and academic writing has been incorporated into the Introduction.

Location: [Pages 2, INTRODUCTION Lines 9]

Comment A8 – Recent Research on EFL Writing

Reviewer Comment:

Recent studies addressing writing challenges in EFL contexts are insufficiently represented.

Response:

Thank you for highlighting this issue. We have expanded the discussion of EFL writing challenges by incorporating recent empirical research, particularly research concerning cognitive strategies, argumentative writing, critical thinking, and technology-supported writing.

The new literature is not merely added to the reference list; it has been integrated into the argument to strengthen the theoretical rationale for the present study.

Revision Made:

The Introduction and Literature Review have been revised to incorporate recent EFL writing research.

Location: [Pages 2, Paragraph 5, Lines 12-15]

Comment A9 – State of the Art and Recent Gen-AI Research

Reviewer Comment:

The literature review should incorporate recent studies, including Mahdavivand Fard (2025), Gao et al. (2025), Yang and Yan (2025), Valerio (2025), and Darmawansah et al. (2025).

Response:

We sincerely appreciate this recommendation. We have carefully considered the suggested studies and incorporated the relevant literature into the revised manuscript.

The revised literature review now discusses recent evidence concerning:

- the relationship between Gen-AI use and critical thinking;
- AI chatbot-integrated writing tasks;
- human-AI hybrid argumentative writing;
- AI-supported argumentative essay development; and
- ChatGPT-supported collaborative argumentation in EFL contexts.

These studies are used not only to establish the state of the art but also to position the present study within current debates.

Revision Made:

The Literature Review has been substantially updated with recent scholarship.

Location: [Pages 4, Paragraph 10, Lines 9-14]

Comment A10 – Research Gap

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Reviewer Comment:
The claim that "none of them reported the combination of traditional writing and e-writing using Gen-AI" should be carefully verified because Yang and Yan (2025) and Valerio (2025) may overlap with the proposed hybrid model.
Response:
We thank the reviewer for this important caution. We agree that the original wording was too categorical. We have therefore revised the research gap statement to avoid claiming that no previous study has examined related hybrid approaches.
Instead, the revised manuscript more carefully positions the contribution of the present study in relation to existing research. Specifically, the present study focuses on the implementation and student perceptions of a complementary combination of traditional writing and e-writing using Gen-AI within an Indonesian EFL Academic Writing context, rather than claiming that hybrid human-AI writing has not previously been investigated.
Revision Made:
The novelty and research-gap statements have been qualified and rewritten to distinguish the present study from Yang and Yan (2025), Valerio (2025), and other related studies.
Location: [Pages 4, Paragraph 10 Lines 9-14]

Comment A11 – Research Question 1
Reviewer Comment:
RQ1 is somewhat ambiguous. The reviewer suggests:
"How does the integration of traditional writing and e-writing using Gen-AI empower students' critical thinking in composing argumentative texts?"
Response:
Thank you for this precise recommendation. We agree that the original wording could be interpreted ambiguously. We have therefore revised RQ1 to more explicitly identify the integration of traditional writing and e-writing using Gen-AI and its relationship to students' critical thinking in composing argumentative texts.
Revision Made:
RQ1 has been revised in accordance with the reviewer's recommendation.
Location: [Page 4, Paragraph 10, Lines 16-17]

Comment A12 – Novelty
Reviewer Comment:
The novelty of the study is underdeveloped and should explain why the combination is significant and how it contributes to the field.
Response:
We appreciate this comment and have substantially revised the discussion of novelty.
The revised manuscript no longer presents the combination of traditional writing and e-writing using Gen-AI as entirely unprecedented. Instead, the contribution is framed more specifically around the empirical examination of how these writing modes are implemented complementarily in an Indonesian EFL higher education context and how students perceive their role in developing critical thinking during argumentative writing.
Revision Made:
The novelty statement has been rewritten and connected more explicitly to previous research.
Location: [Pages 4, Paragraph 10, Lines 19-22]

Comment A13 – Significance of the Study

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Reviewer Comment:
The manuscript should explain how the findings may inform curriculum design, teaching strategies, and assessment practices.
Response:
Thank you for this constructive recommendation. We have added and expanded a dedicated discussion of the significance of the study.
The revised manuscript explains the implications of the findings for:

1. the design of Academic Writing curricula;
2. the integration of traditional and digital writing practices;
3. responsible and critical use of Gen-AI;
4. teacher-guided AI literacy;
5. the development of students' argumentative writing skills; and
6. assessment practices that consider both the writing process and the quality of students' reasoning.

Revision Made:
A more explicit discussion of the significance and practical contribution of the study has been added.
Location: [Pages 4, Paragraph 10, Lines 19-22]

Comment A14 – References: Number and Currency
Reviewer Comment:
The manuscript should contain at least 50 references, with at least 80% published during 2023–2026.
Response:
We fully acknowledge this requirement. We have substantially revised the reference list by adding recent and relevant publications, particularly studies published between 2023 and 2026.
We have also reviewed the references to ensure that recent sources are integrated into the manuscript rather than merely added to the reference list.
Revision Made:
The reference list has been updated to meet the journal's requirements concerning the minimum number and recency of references.
Location: [Reference List]

Comment A15 – APA 7th Edition and DOI
Reviewer Comment:
The reference list contains inconsistencies in APA 7th formatting, missing DOIs, and inconsistencies between in-text citations and references.
Response:
Thank you for identifying these issues. We have conducted a comprehensive revision of the reference list according to APA 7th edition. We have checked author names, publication years, article titles, journal titles, volume and issue numbers, page ranges, DOI formatting, and consistency between in-text citations and the reference list.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Revision Made:
The entire reference list has been checked and standardized according to APA 7th edition. Available DOIs have also been added and standardized.
Location: [Reference List]

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER B
Manuscript Title:
Traditional Writing and E-Writing Using Gen-AI to Empower Students' Critical Thinking in Argumentative Text
Journal:
English Review: Journal of English Education (ERJEE)
Manuscript ID: [235]
Authors:
Dedeh Rohayati, Etika Rachmawati, R. Bunga Febriani, and Bambang Ruby Sugiarto

Dear Editor and Reviewers,
We sincerely thank the Editor and the Reviewers for their careful reading of our manuscript and for providing constructive and insightful comments. We greatly appreciate the time and effort invested in reviewing our work. The comments have helped us identify important areas for improvement and have enabled us to strengthen the manuscript substantially.
We have carefully considered all comments and suggestions and have revised the manuscript accordingly. In particular, we have:

1. revised the title and abstract to improve contextual specificity and methodological clarity;
2. updated and substantially expanded the literature review with recent scholarship on Gen-AI, critical thinking, argumentative writing, and human-AI hybrid writing;
3. clarified the research gap, novelty, and significance of the study;
4. expanded the Method section by providing greater detail about the research context, participant selection, observation procedures, document analysis, coding procedures, and trustworthiness;
5. strengthened the Results and Discussion section through more explicit interpretation of the findings, triangulation across data sources, and connections with relevant theoretical frameworks;
6. incorporated recent scholarship to discuss the potential of Gen-AI both to support and to weaken students' critical thinking;
7. strengthened the Conclusion by explicitly presenting the contribution of the study, limitations, future research directions, and pedagogical implications for Indonesian EFL writing;
8. revised the manuscript for grammatical accuracy, clarity, conciseness, and academic style; and

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

9. substantially revised and standardized the reference list according to APA 7th edition and the journal's requirements.

Following the reviewers' suggestions, we have provided a detailed point-by-point response below. For ease of reference, the reviewers' comments are presented in **bold**, followed by our responses. The exact page and line numbers will correspond to the revised manuscript.
We hope that the revisions have addressed the reviewers' concerns and have substantially strengthened the manuscript.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER B
We sincerely thank Reviewer B for the detailed and constructive comments concerning the methodology, results and discussion, conclusion, implications, limitations, and overall readability of the manuscript. We have addressed the comments as follows.
Comment B1 – Research Site and Institutional Context
Reviewer Comment:
The research site and institutional context are not sufficiently described. Additional contextual information should be provided.
Response:
Thank you for this important suggestion. We agree that a clearer description of the research context is necessary to support the transferability of the findings. We have therefore expanded the Method section to provide additional contextual information about the institution, the Academic Writing course, the participants' educational level, and the learning context in which the hybrid writing model was implemented.
Revision Made:
Additional contextual information about the research site and instructional setting has been added.
Location: [METHOD: Page 4, Paragraph 1, Lines 5-6]

Comment B2 – Purposive Sampling
Reviewer Comment:
The sampling procedure should be justified more clearly, particularly why purposive sampling was appropriate.
Response:
We appreciate this recommendation. The revised manuscript now explains that purposive sampling was used because the study sought participants who could provide information-rich data concerning different levels of academic writing performance.
The participants were selected according to GPA categories representing low-, mid-, and high-achieving students, allowing the study to explore possible variations in students' experiences and perceptions.
Revision Made:
The rationale for purposive sampling has been explicitly explained.
Location: [METHOD: Page 4, Paragraph 1, Lines 6-11]

Comment B3 – Observation Procedure
Reviewer Comment:
The observation procedure should be described in more detail, including what was observed and how observations were recorded.
Response:
Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have expanded the observation procedure and clarified the specific aspects observed during the writing activities.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

The revised description explains the observation focus, including students' engagement with traditional writing, e-writing, Gen-AI interaction, development of argumentative elements, and classroom activities related to the writing process. We have also clarified how observational data were documented.

Revision Made:

The observation procedure and documentation process have been described in greater detail.

Location: [METHOD: Page 5, Paragraph 2, Lines 1–7]

Comment B4 – Data Analysis Procedures

Reviewer Comment:

The statement that "observation analysis is similar to semi-structured interview" is unclear. Analytical procedures should be described separately for each data source.

Response:

We appreciate this clarification. We agree that the previous wording could cause confusion. We have revised the Method section to distinguish the analytical procedures applied to observations, student documents, and semi-structured interviews.

For the interview data, thematic analysis was used to identify recurring patterns and themes. Observational data were analyzed separately to identify patterns in students' writing behaviors and classroom interactions. Student documents were analyzed according to the identified argumentative and critical-thinking elements.

Revision Made:

The data analysis procedures have been separated according to the three principal data sources.

Location: [METHOD: Page 5, Paragraph 2-3]

Comment B5 – Document Analysis and Coding

Reviewer Comment:

The validation process for document analysis is insufficiently explained. The authors should clarify how thesis statements, arguments, reasons, facts/data, and opinions were identified and coded.

Response:

Thank you for highlighting this methodological issue. We have expanded the explanation of document analysis and coding.

The revised manuscript explains the analytical categories used to examine students' argumentative texts, including thesis statements, arguments, reasons, facts/data, and opinions. We have also clarified how these elements were identified in students' writing and how the coding process was used to compare the writing produced before and after Gen-AI assistance.

Revision Made:

The document analysis and coding procedures have been described more transparently.

Location: [METHOD: Page 3]

Comment B6 – Trustworthiness

Reviewer Comment:

The manuscript does not explicitly address credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Appropriate strategies such as member checking, peer debriefing, and thick description should be discussed.

Response:

We sincerely appreciate this important methodological recommendation. We agree that the trustworthiness of qualitative research should be explicitly addressed.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Accordingly, we have added a dedicated explanation of trustworthiness covering credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The revised manuscript also explains the relevant strategies used to strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings, including triangulation across data sources, member checking where applicable, peer discussion/debriefing, and contextual description.

Revision Made:

A dedicated trustworthiness subsection has been added to the Method section.

Location: [METHOD: Page 5, Paragraph 3, Lines 9-10]; [METHOD: Page 5, Paragraph 2, Lines 17-18]

Comment B7 – Table 1

Reviewer Comment:

Table 1 is introduced but not sufficiently discussed. The reviewer recommends analyzing which critical-thinking elements demonstrated the greatest improvement and whether differences existed among students at different achievement levels.

Response:

Thank you for this valuable observation. We have expanded the narrative interpretation accompanying Table 1.

The revised Results and Discussion section now identifies the main patterns observed in the critical-thinking elements before and after Gen-AI assistance and explains the most noticeable changes. Where supported by the data, the revised discussion also considers differences across students representing different achievement levels.

Revision Made:

The discussion accompanying Table 1 has been substantially expanded.

Location: [RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: **Students' documents of argumentative text** Page 6, Paragraph 4, Lines 10-11; Table 1],

Comment B8 – Theoretical Frameworks

Reviewer Comment:

The discussion should be more strongly connected to Bloom's Taxonomy, Constructivist Learning Theory, and Cognitive Load Theory (CLT).

Response:

We appreciate this recommendation. We have strengthened the theoretical interpretation of the findings by explicitly connecting the observed writing processes and students' experiences to the theoretical frameworks established in the manuscript.

The revised discussion considers how students' activities may reflect different cognitive processes in Bloom's Taxonomy and how interaction with writing tools can be interpreted through constructivist learning principles and Cognitive Load Theory.

Revision Made:

The Results and Discussion section now explicitly connects the findings with the relevant theoretical frameworks.

Location: [RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**: How do they perceive towards the implemented model?** Pages 10, Last Paragraph, Lines 6-11]

Comment B9 – Challenges of Traditional Writing

Reviewer Comment:

Students' perceptions that traditional writing is tiring and that they engage less frequently in pen-and-paper writing should be explored more deeply.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Response:
Thank you for pointing out this important aspect of the findings. We have expanded the discussion of students' perceptions of traditional writing.
The revised discussion explains that students' descriptions of traditional writing as tiring should not necessarily be interpreted as evidence that traditional writing is ineffective. Rather, the findings suggest that students perceive different cognitive and practical demands associated with traditional writing and digital/AI-assisted writing. This distinction is now discussed more explicitly.
Revision Made:
The discussion of students' perceptions and challenges concerning traditional writing has been expanded.
Location: [RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**: How do they perceive towards the implemented model?** Pages 10, Last Paragraph, Lines 6-11]

Comment B10 – Recent Research
Reviewer Comment:
The discussion should engage more deeply with recent studies, including Yang and Yan (2025), Mahdavivand Fard (2025), and Gao et al. (2025).
Response:
We agree with the reviewer. The revised Discussion section now explicitly compares our findings with recent studies concerning human-AI hybrid writing, AI-assisted argumentative writing, and critical thinking.
The comparison is used to identify areas of convergence and divergence between our findings and previous research.
Revision Made:
Recent studies have been incorporated into the Discussion and used to interpret the findings comparatively.
Location: [RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**: How do they perceive towards the implemented model?** Pages 10, Last Paragraph, Lines 6-11]

Comment B11 – Gen-AI as Both Support and Risk
Reviewer Comment:
The statement that Gen-AI could either support or weaken critical thinking requires further elaboration, particularly concerning cognitive dependency and habitual reliance on Gen-AI.
Response:
Thank you for highlighting this important finding. We have substantially expanded this discussion.
The revised manuscript emphasizes that Gen-AI should not be understood as inherently beneficial or harmful to critical thinking. Its effects may depend on how students interact with the technology. When students critically evaluate, question, verify, and revise AI-generated suggestions, Gen-AI may function as a cognitive and writing support. Conversely, uncritical acceptance of AI-generated content may reduce opportunities for independent reasoning and encourage cognitive dependency.
We have also connected this interpretation with recent scholarship on AI reliance and critical engagement.
Revision Made:
The Discussion now provides a more nuanced interpretation of the dual potential of Gen-AI.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Location: [RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**: How do they perceive towards the implemented model?** Pages 10, Last Paragraph, Lines 6-11]

Comment B12 – Implications for Indonesian EFL Writing Pedagogy
Reviewer Comment:
The implications for Indonesian EFL writing pedagogy are insufficiently discussed.
Response:
We appreciate this important recommendation. We have expanded the pedagogical implications by providing more concrete recommendations for Indonesian EFL writing instruction.
The revised manuscript suggests that teachers should not simply replace traditional writing with AI-assisted writing. Instead, instructional design can combine traditional planning and drafting activities with guided e-writing and responsible Gen-AI use. Students should also be explicitly taught to evaluate AI-generated information, verify evidence, refine arguments, and retain responsibility for their final written decisions.
Revision Made:
A more specific discussion of implications for Indonesian EFL writing pedagogy has been added.
Location: [RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**: How do they perceive towards the implemented model?** Pages 10, Last Paragraph, Lines 10-11]

Comment B13 – Contribution to Knowledge
Reviewer Comment:
The conclusion does not clearly articulate the contribution of the study to knowledge.
Response:
Thank you for this comment. We have revised the Conclusion to explicitly state the study's contribution.
The study contributes empirical insight into the complementary use of traditional writing and e-writing using Gen-AI in an Indonesian EFL higher education context. It particularly contributes to understanding how students perceive and enact the relationship between writing modes, Gen-AI, argumentative writing, and critical thinking.
Revision Made:
The contribution to knowledge is now explicitly stated in the Conclusion.
Location: [CONCLUSION, Paragraph 3, Page 11, Lines 1-3]

Comment B14 – Study Limitations
Reviewer Comment:
The limitations are not addressed. These include the small interview sample, single-institution setting, reliance on self-reported data, and absence of a direct critical-thinking assessment beyond document analysis.
Response:
We agree with the reviewer and appreciate this important suggestion. A limitations paragraph has been added to the Conclusion.
The revised manuscript explicitly acknowledges the limited number of interview participants, the single-institution setting, the reliance on participants' self-reported perceptions in the interview data, and the absence of a standardized pre- and post-assessment of critical thinking. These limitations are now presented transparently to avoid overgeneralization of the findings.
Revision Made:
A dedicated limitations statement has been added.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

Location: [CONCLUSION, Paragraph 3, Page 11, Lines 5-6]

Comment B15 – Future Research
Reviewer Comment:
Future research should explain more specifically what the proposed categories of "feeling, contrast and construct forming" could reveal.
Response:
Thank you for this constructive suggestion. We have clarified the proposed directions for future research.
The revised manuscript explains that exploring students' feelings may provide insight into their affective responses to traditional and AI-assisted writing; examining contrast may reveal how students perceive differences between writing modes; and examining construct-forming processes may provide insight into how students develop, negotiate, and transform their understanding of argumentative writing and critical thinking through interaction with Gen-AI.
Revision Made:
The future research recommendations have been made more specific.
Location: [CONCLUSION, Paragraph 3, Page 11, Lines 6-8]

Comment B16 – Pedagogical and Curricular Implications
Reviewer Comment:
The implications are generic and should be connected to specific pedagogical or curricular recommendations.
Response:
We appreciate this suggestion. We have revised the implications to provide more concrete recommendations.
The revised manuscript recommends a guided hybrid writing model in which students engage in traditional writing activities before and/or alongside Gen-AI-assisted e-writing. Teachers can explicitly integrate AI literacy, source verification, prompt evaluation, argument evaluation, and reflection into writing instruction. Assessment can also emphasize the writing process, reasoning, evidence use, and students' ability to critically evaluate AI-generated suggestions.
Revision Made:
The pedagogical and curricular implications have been expanded and made more specific.
Location: [CONCLUSION, Paragraph 3, Page 11, Lines 1-2]

Comment B17 – Grammar and Academic Style
Reviewer Comment:
Some sentences are grammatically awkward, and several expressions should be revised to achieve a more academic style. Long sentences in the Introduction should also be divided.
Response:
Thank you for identifying these language issues. We have carefully proofread and edited the entire manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, conciseness, clarity, and academic tone.
In particular, expressions such as "it is totally required by the academic to utilize the Gen-AI in a wise way" have been revised into more academically appropriate language. Informal expressions such as "sound effective and powerful" have also been replaced with more precise academic wording.
Revision Made:
The manuscript has undergone comprehensive language and style editing.
Location: Throughout the revised manuscript.

Top margin	: 2.54 cm	Bottom margin	: 2.54 cm
Right margin	: 2.54 cm	Left margin	: 2.54 cm

GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE MAJOR REVISION

We are grateful to both reviewers for identifying several interconnected areas that required substantial improvement. In response, we have revised the manuscript holistically rather than treating the comments as isolated corrections.

The major revisions focus on five interconnected areas:

1. Strengthening the theoretical and empirical foundation

The Literature Review has been substantially updated to include recent scholarship on Gen-AI, critical thinking, argumentative writing, human-AI collaboration, and AI-supported writing.

2. Improving methodological transparency

The Method section now provides more detailed information concerning the research context, purposive sampling, observation procedures, document analysis, coding, data analysis, and trustworthiness.

3. Strengthening Results and Discussion

The revised Discussion provides a more analytical interpretation of the findings, including stronger triangulation among observations, student documents, and interviews, and clearer connections to Bloom's Taxonomy, Constructivist Learning Theory, and Cognitive Load Theory.

4. Clarifying contribution, limitations, and implications

The Conclusion now explicitly identifies the study's contribution, acknowledges its limitations, provides specific future research directions, and presents pedagogical implications for Indonesian EFL writing instruction.

5. Improving references and academic presentation

The reference list has been comprehensively reviewed and updated according to APA 7th edition and the journal's requirements. We have also revised the manuscript's grammar, sentence structure, academic tone, and overall readability.

Closing Statement

We sincerely thank the Editor and both Reviewers for their thoughtful and constructive comments. Their feedback has enabled us to improve the manuscript substantially in terms of its theoretical grounding, methodological transparency, interpretation of findings, scholarly contribution, and practical relevance.

We have made every effort to address all comments carefully and transparently. We hope that the revised manuscript is now substantially stronger and suitable for further consideration in *English Review: Journal of English Education (ERJEE)*.

Thank you again for your valuable time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dedeh Rohayati
on behalf of all authors
Dedeh Rohayati
Etika Rachmawati
R. Bunga Febriani
Bambang Ruby Sugiarto
Universitas Galuh, Ciamis, Indonesia