

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_127156
Title of the Manuscript:	Leveraging Synthetic Data as a Tool to Combat Bias In Artificial Intelligence (AI) Model Training
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is well structured as per the journal. The manuscript content is good and well defined related to the synthetic data which improve the performance of the model. The manuscript uses few models for the comparing the performance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title of the article is suitable	
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.	Yes the abstract is good and well defined.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yea all the subsection are in proper structure	
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.	The manuscript is well defined. The manuscript is properly defined the robustness of the methods with the help of various comparisons in the manuscript. The manuscript contain sufficient technical information regarding the role of synthetic data in improving the performance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the references are sufficient and properly cited in the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes the language is quality is good	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Taranpreet Singh Ruprah
Department, University & Country	Amity University Jaipur, India