

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_121399</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Banking and Fraud Prevention: A cross sectional study in Ghana.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript does a great job of explaining the contributions of AI in banking and fraud prevention, specifically within the context of Ghana. It highlights the importance of AI in enhancing security measures and improving customer experience in the Banking sector. The insights are valuable for financial institutions, policymakers, and educators looking to increase AI adoption and trust within the banking sector. Overall, the manuscript addresses a relevant and timely topic with practical implications for the industry. However, a more detailed analysis of the specific AI technologies used in different use cases, such as banking fraud prevention, would provide deeper insights into the practical applications of AI in the sector.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is apt and provides a good indication of the content or topic of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview and a clear summary of the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. The authors have effectively summarized the key findings and implications of the research.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections for introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Adding a "Discussion" section to interpret the findings in greater depth and compare them with existing literature would enhance the manuscript greatly and clearly show the novelty of the work.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The methods are appropriate, and the analysis is thorough, providing a clear understanding of AI's impact on the banking sector.</p> <p>Suggestion: Describing how the analysis was done more in-depth would greatly enhance the manuscript's quality. For example, the below sentence gives a very brief overview of the analysis but leaves a lot of details.</p> <p><i>"Statistical methods, including descriptive statistics and inferential analysis, was employed to interpret the data."</i></p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient and cover recent studies on the relevant aspects of AI.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the manuscript is overall great. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors. For example, the authors have used "was" in place of "were" in one place, and in another place, they have incorrectly put a comma. Suggest the authors to proof-read the manuscript to remove grammatical errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I strongly recommend updating the figures for more clarity. In Figure 1, the titles on the x-axis are cut off, while in Figure 2, "Neutral" is spelled as "Neuta."</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Pranav Khare</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Georgetown University, USA</b>