

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125192
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Machine Learning in Enhancing Corporate Financial Planning
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses the growing role of machine learning in enhancing corporate financial planning, a field that is becoming increasingly data-driven and complex. By integrating advanced ML models, this research offers insights into more accurate financial forecasting, better risk management, and automation of routine tasks. I particularly appreciate the manuscript's focus on the practical applications of machine learning, as it bridges the gap between theoretical advancements and real-world corporate finance needs. However, further clarity could be beneficial in explaining how these models handle challenges like data quality and regulatory concerns.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "The Role of Machine Learning in Enhancing Corporate Financial Planning" is clear and directly addresses the core theme of the article. However, it could be refined to reflect the specific focus on how machine learning methods transform financial decision-making and risk management. The title is very general and can be mentioned specific aspects</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a clear overview of the manuscript, including the aim, problem statement, significance, methodology, and key findings. However, there are areas where clarity and specificity could be improved. Clarify the Methodologies, Elaboration of Findings, Challenges of ML and Refine the Language can be improved</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The title is very general but More sections can be added like: Corporate Financial Planning: Current Landscape, The Role of Machine Learning in Corporate Finance, Key Machine Learning Techniques Used in Financial Planning, Applications of Machine Learning in Corporate Financial Planning, Challenges in Implementing Machine Learning in Financial Planning, Future Prospects for Machine Learning in Corporate Financial Planning</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript found very weak w.r.t to current and future prospects of ML Models. The manuscript is scientifically robust, drawing from credible sources and integrating relevant machine learning concepts. Its discussion on how ML adapts to evolving market conditions, handles real-time data, and provides actionable insights demonstrates a solid understanding of both financial planning and machine learning methodologies. However, some areas, such as interpretability and fairness, could benefit from deeper technical insights or examples to showcase how financial institutions are currently dealing with these issues.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Reference are not sufficient but all the references are recent</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>Methodology Detail: The methodology section is somewhat vague. A more detailed explanation of how the reviewed articles were selected (e.g., the databases used, inclusion/exclusion criteria) would strengthen the paper’s methodological rigor and make it easier to replicate or assess the scope of the research.</p> <p>Flow and Structure: While the manuscript is thorough, some sections, especially in the introduction, repeat similar points regarding traditional financial models’ limitations and ML’s capabilities. Streamlining these sections would improve readability and prevent redundancy.</p> <p>Practical Case Studies: Including more specific case studies or examples where ML has been successfully applied in corporate financial planning would add practical value to the article. For instance, discussing how a specific bank or insurance company implemented ML in real-time risk assessment or fraud detection could provide readers with concrete, relatable examples.</p> <p>Challenges Section Expansion: The challenges mentioned (data security, algorithmic bias, model interpretability) are important but could benefit from further exploration. For example, the challenge of “black box” ML models (lack of transparency in decision-making processes) could be expanded with potential solutions such as explainable AI (XAI).</p> <p>Figures and Tables: The inclusion of only one figure (Figure 1) limits the manuscript’s visual aids. Adding more diagrams, tables, or flowcharts that summarize key concepts (e.g., ML techniques, use cases in financial planning) would enhance the paper’s clarity and engagement.</p>	
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Chetan Bulla</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>VTU, India</p>