

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_129387
Title of the Manuscript:	Emerging Trends and Insights: A Comprehensive Bibliometric Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Applications in Healthcare and Psychology
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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Topic is interesting but authors has not reviewed properly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is ok	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is correct but not rigorous. The methodology portion needs to be strengthened with the requirements of a detailed explanation. Interpretations are mostly not in-depth. The author does not describe why only Scopus but not WOS and other databases. That should be justified. In bibliometrics, it's essential to find out the future research scope, but I do not find anything with no policy and implication described by the author. The author needs to address the limitations of the manuscript in the last section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Acceptable	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Manageable but need to be proofreading.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs to update more in every aspect. Here's a structured critique addressing the points rigorously: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen the Methodology with detailed explanations of data collection, analysis techniques, and model. 2. Enhance Interpretations with in-depth analysis and reasoning behind findings. 3. Justify the selection of Scopus over Web of Science or other databases. 4. Include policy implications to highlight the practical relevance of findings. 5. Identify future research directions in bibliometric studies. 6. Address limitations in the concluding section for transparency. 7. Discuss the rationale for chosen methods and tools. 8. Ensure findings are aligned with objectives. 	

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:	Soumya Ranjan Sethi
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, India