

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARRB_122911</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>AI in Reproductive Biology: Transforming Fertility Assessment, ART, and Research</b>
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: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is based on a topic of advance research that guides the scientific domain to search more in this field. But the manner of writing is not appropriate also, there are few queries that have to be addressed:</p> <p>AQ1: Abstract is too vast, kindly concise it.</p> <p>AQ2: Check the word limit for this category of manuscript.</p> <p>AQ3: Authors have written a lot about utility of AI in various fields but how they are used is not mentioned.</p> <p>AQ4: Authors have written some factual points but references are not quoted. Please provide.</p> <p>AQ5: References are very less.</p> <p>AQ6: Rewrite the limitations.</p> <p>AQ7: English is not up to the mark.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>		

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Sumit Aggarwal
Department, University & Country	India