

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_117352
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of AI and Chatbots in Omnichannel Customer Service
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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. Yes, it's true that the manuscript is important to the scientific community. The primary goal of this paper is to present their research, facilitating peer review, information transfer, and the advancement of science. Scientists add to the body of knowledge by publishing their findings and expanding on earlier studies.</p> <p>2. Yes, Title is good enough</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is concise and comprehensive. It summarizes the research question, methodology, main findings, and conclusions of the article.</p> <p>4. Formatting of subsection and structure need some changes. Please check again and do correct formatting.</p> <p>5. Manuscript is almost correct for publication after some changing as mentioned in this report.</p> <p>6. yes, references are sufficient.</p> <p>Number of pages are okay, but lots of gap between paragraphs, Needs editing corrections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language of article is good, only some grammatical errors are there. Please check and remove these errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priyanka
Department, University & Country	Ch. Bansilal University, India