

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	

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community because it explores an issue that is relevant to communities, scientific, educational, technological, etc.</p> <p>2. The title of the article corresponds to the content of the manuscript</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is quite sufficient to understand the essence of the matter.</p> <p>4 The structure of the manuscript is well done. One remark: it is hardly reasonable to make the introduction as a deepening of the structure; point one, which denotes the introduction, is further specified as 1.1, and then 1.1.1. I propose to simplify the structure of the introduction. 1.1.1. – an important point regarding the application of research to healthcare, make in boxing.</p> <p>5. From a scientific point of view, the manuscript is correct and has a good system of references to sources.</p> <p>6. Links are made flawlessly, there are no comments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English is of quite good quality for scientific communication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petr Mikhailovich Korolev
Department, University & Country	Russia