

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_129354
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Analysis of CTI Integration: Security, Scalability, and Challenges in Legacy vs. Cloud-Based Contact Center Systems</b>
Type of the Article	

#### 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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript provides a comparative analysis of legacy and cloud-based contact center systems, it bridges a crucial knowledge gap for researchers and practitioners exploring scalable, secure, and cost-effective integration methodologies. The inclusion of real-world case studies and compliance frameworks, such as GDPR and HIPAA, adds a practical dimension, enhancing its relevance for industry stakeholders. Furthermore, its focus on emerging trends like AI-driven analytics and omnichannel communication paves the way for future research, fostering innovation in customer engagement technologies.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Title could be refined to make it more concise and engaging while maintaining clarity. A potential alternative might be: <b>"CTI Integration in Contact Centers: A Comparative Study of Legacy and Cloud-Based Systems."</b>	
<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>	<b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b> <b>1. Conciseness:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The abstract is somewhat lengthy and repeats certain points that can be omitted for brevity. For instance, phrases like <i>"focusing on security considerations, challenges, and methods for achieving robust Computer Telephony Integration (CTI) implementations"</i> could be condensed.</li> </ul> <b>2. Key Findings Emphasis:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The findings about the advantages of cloud-based solutions (e.g., scalability, flexibility, security) and the challenges of legacy systems could be summarized more prominently to immediately capture the reader's attention. Add specific statistics or metrics from the results, such as performance improvements, cost reductions, or scalability metrics, to substantiate the claims.</li> </ul> <b>3. Specificity:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the abstract mentions "industry practices," it could benefit from specifying the industries or types of organizations examined.</li> </ul> <b>4. Future Research:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The call for future research is generic. It would be more impactful to specify actionable research directions, such as exploring advanced AI applications in CTI, hybrid models, or novel security frameworks.</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct in its overall approach and conclusions. However, to further enhance its rigor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include quantitative data and metrics to support key claims.</li> <li>Provide more detail about the scope and representativeness of case studies.</li> <li>Strengthen the discussion on emerging trends with evidence or detailed analysis.</li> <li>Consider formalizing the comparison framework for greater clarity.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Update the Reference List:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include more recent studies and industry reports published between 2020 and 2024. For example:</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research on the latest trends in CTI integration, such as <b>AI-enabled contact centers</b>, could be drawn from recent journal articles or whitepapers.</li> <li>○ Studies on hybrid contact center systems and their challenges could be referenced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Add Missing Citations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Include references to support claims about emerging trends like omnichannel support, AI-powered automation, and scalability advantages of cloud systems.</li> </ul> <p><b>Standardize the Formatting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Use a consistent citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, or IEEE) throughout the manuscript. Include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Full author names.</li> <li>○ Publication year.</li> <li>○ Journal or book titles in italics.</li> <li>○ DOI links where applicable.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Weaknesses and Suggestions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Overuse of Repetition:</b>              Certain points, such as the advantages of cloud-based systems, are repeated in multiple sections. This redundancy detracts from the overall conciseness of the text.  <b>Suggestion:</b> Eliminate repetitive phrases and streamline discussions to make the manuscript more concise and impactful.</li> <li>2. <b>Informal Expressions:</b>              Phrases such as “cloud solutions benefit from continuous updates” could be rephrased to align with a more formal scholarly tone.  <b>Suggestion:</b> Replace informal expressions with formal alternatives, such as “cloud-based solutions are characterized by ongoing updates that enhance operational performance.”</li> <li>3. <b>Sentence Construction:</b>              Some sentences are overly long and complex, potentially obscuring key points. For example: “Legacy contact centers... require extensive integration effort to connect with modern business applications.”  <b>Suggestion:</b> Break such sentences into shorter, more direct statements to improve readability.</li> <li>4. <b>Lack of Hedging Language:</b>              The manuscript makes assertive claims like “cloud solutions are better suited for modern, dynamic contact centers,” which could benefit from more cautious phrasing to reflect the possibility of exceptions.  <b>Suggestion:</b> Use hedging terms such as “tend to,” “often,” or “may” to indicate nuance and acknowledge potential limitations.</li> <li>5. <b>Grammatical and Stylistic Issues:</b>              Minor grammatical errors, such as inconsistent verb tenses and missing articles, occasionally appear (e.g., “important constituent part of modern-day cloud contact centers” should include “an important...”).  <b>Suggestion:</b> Conduct a thorough grammatical review or employ professional editing tools to ensure consistency.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Habibur Rahaman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of London, United Kingdom</b>