

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JERR_117851
Title of the Manuscript:	AI for Automated Regulatory Compliance Tracking
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It addresses a significant and relevant topic: the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in automating regulatory compliance tracking. 2. Yes, the title is suitable. 3. No, the article's abstract needs to be more comprehensive and detailed. While it introduces the topic and the benefits of AI in compliance tracking, it lacks specific information on the problem addressed, the methodologies used, the key findings, and the implications. 4. The manuscript's structure and subsections are generally appropriate but could be improved for better clarity and readability. The section numbering in the manuscript is inconsistent and could be improved (Examples 1.1, 1.1.1 have only one section). 5. The manuscript demonstrates a good understanding of the concepts and technologies involved in AI and regulatory compliance tracking. It accurately describes the challenges of manual compliance tracking and the potential benefits of using AI to automate this process. The discussion of AI techniques, such as natural language processing and machine learning, is generally accurate, although it could be more in-depth. 6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. <p>Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please explicitly state the problem the paper aims to address. While it mentions the importance of regulatory compliance and the challenges of manual tracking, a clear articulation of the problem or problems that AI aims to solve is missing. • The paper has limited discussion of AI technologies. Some techniques are explained very highly and do not clearly define which specific AI technologies are used in compliance tracking. For instance, it could delve deeper into natural language processing (NLP), machine learning algorithms, and how they are applied to regulatory texts and data. • Please mention or refer to your figures in the manuscript. None of the figures are described or explained. Please remove them if you do not use them in your text. • It may be better to switch Sections 3 and 4 to explain Compliance Tracking Systems first, then mention how AI automation can be integrated into those systems. • There is a repetitive explanation of compliance tracking, which could be condensed to provide better readability. • Please do not use section numbers if you have only one subsection. For example, sections 1.1 and 1.1.1 each have only one subsection. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why do you have a separate section for the Healthcare industry, although you mentioned other sectors in section 1.1? Please mention if it is more important than others, or make the sections consistent. Please mention abbreviations in the text once. For example, you have already mentioned that AI stands for Artificial Intelligence and ML stands for Machine Learning. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are mostly suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	I found the paper easy to understand and follow. It includes a comprehensive literature review related to regulatory compliance in various industries. The paper mentions some of the automation techniques that AI can achieve in Compliance Tracking Systems. The paper/report could be better organized with a systematic approach to review the AI techniques that can be applied to key features of compliance tracking systems. Additionally, the paper may benefit from including future directions and new trends such as generative AI.	

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:	Berk Bekiroglu
Department, University & Country	Illinois Institute of Technology, United States