

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_12771
Title of the Manuscript:	Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare and Medicine
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 topic "Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare and Medicine", is relevant with the scope of the journal and helpful for the scientific community as the authors had discussed about the AI in healthcare and medical field from patient history to personalized medicine prescription.	Thanks

Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	Thanks
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 authors had discussed about importance of AI in Healthcare but did not stressed about their work and findings from the survey.	Thanks
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, as the authors had explained in detail about the importance of AI in healthcare in terms of patient history to medicine prescription	Thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, authors had referred a range of papers across 2014 to 2024 but it could be better if they included more papers from recent years because the references have only on paper from 2024	Suggestion of learned reviewer kindly accepted, and incorporated in the revised manuscript appropriately.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes but grammatical corrections in few places and also suggest the authors to check the spellings throughout the paper.	Suggestion of learned reviewer kindly accepted, and incorporated in the revised manuscript appropriately.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors had not labelled the fig. in Introduction (Pg.no.2). the authours could have listed their finding in the tabular form along with the explanation so that it will help the reader in better way.	In fact, this figure represents Graphical Abstract, and thus not required to label.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	