

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_127882
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Generative AI: Models, Applications, and Challenges in Data Synthesis
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: 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 manuscript only compares various Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), and Auto-Regressive models. The author vision not clearly define in writing this paper.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title 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.	The abstract is not clearly define. It have ambiguity No comparative parameters are define	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Only the comparison is shown , no scientific equations are define in it	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not clearly define and citations are not clearly cited in the manuscript, Also the reference section is very weak.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of language is ok	
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
Department, University & Country	Amity University Jaipur, India