

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_127004
Title of the Manuscript:	The Transformative Potential Of Artificial Intelligence And Computer Science In Promoting Environmental Sustainability And Mitigating Climate Change
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 addresses the critical role of artificial intelligence (AI) and computer science in environmental sustainability and climate change mitigation. By exploring AI's potential to enhance renewable energy systems, monitor ecosystems, and support biodiversity, the paper provides valuable insights into the intersection of technology and environmental protection. This work is essential for the scientific community as it underscores AI's potential to address climate challenges, which is of global relevance, and advocates for interdisciplinary collaboration. This manuscript can inspire future research in responsible AI for sustainable development, making it a valuable addition to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the paper's content, highlighting the transformative potential of AI in promoting environmental sustainability. It is suitable as it encompasses both the technological and environmental aspects central to the paper's focus.	
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 abstract provides a concise overview of the study, outlining the main focus areas such as AI's role in environmental monitoring, energy optimization, and conservation efforts. However, it could be improved by including a brief mention of the methodologies used (e.g., mixed-methods approach) and key findings. Adding a statement on the study's implications for future research and policy could enhance its comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is appropriate, with clear subsections for the introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, discussion, and conclusion. This organization effectively supports the paper's logical flow, making it easy to follow.	
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 scientifically robust and technically sound, providing a well-rounded analysis of AI's applications in environmental sustainability. The methodologies are appropriate for addressing the research questions, and the findings are grounded in both literature and case studies. The study also highlights the ethical implications, making it a balanced approach to the topic. The inclusion of recent examples like Google's DeepMind and Wildbook demonstrates practical implementations, reinforcing the manuscript's relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and relevant, covering recent literature in the field. However, incorporating a few more sources on the ethical dimensions of AI in environmental applications could further strengthen the manuscript. Adding references related to AI's role in climate policy and its social implications may also be beneficial.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are minor grammatical and syntactical errors that require attention. Some sentences could be refined for clarity, and certain technical terms should be defined to ensure accessibility for a broader audience.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from an additional subsection in the discussion addressing limitations, such as the challenges of data reliability and the risks of algorithmic bias, which are pertinent to the practical deployment of AI in environmental settings.	

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:	Chandra Sekhar Veluru
Department, University & Country	United States