

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_102970
Title of the Manuscript:	Automation of routine tasks through AI integration with Salesforce
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Ans: Yes. If Author(s) can add applications, advantages and disadvantages as separate section that would be great.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Ans: Looks good to me.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form Ans: Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>For detail information can Author(s) refer manuscript for the comments?</p> <p>1) There are no pictures. Can Author(s) add few pictures in the manuscript?</p> <p>2) There are links for few references. But there are no links for other references. Can Author(s) maintain consistency for all references?</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manu Mitra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bridgeport, USA</b>