Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_129118**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative Analysis of Guidewire ClaimCenter vs Duck Creek Claims**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**This manuscript is valuable for insurance professionals and also for the scientific community. This manuscript holds significance for the insurance industry by providing a comparative analysis of two leading claims management systems. By highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of Guidewire ClaimCenter and Duck Creek Claims, it assists insurance professionals in making informed decisions about technology investments. This analysis contributes to the broader discourse on digital transformation within the insurance sector, emphasizing the importance of selecting the right technology to improve operational efficiency, enhance customer experience, and achieve competitive advantage.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title, "Guidewire ClaimCenter vs. Duck Creek Claims: A Comparative Analysis for Insurers" accurately reflects the content. The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit by mentioning the target audience (insurers) and the key differentiators between the two platforms (e.g., scalability vs. rapid deployment).**	
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.	**The abstract is generally comprehensive, but it could be further enhanced. Explicitly stating that this study is primarily intended for insurance professionals and decision-makers would improve its clarity. Furthermore, highlighting the key differentiators between the two platforms, such as Guidewire's strength in enterprise-level scalability and customization compared to Duck Creek's focus on cloud-native architecture and rapid deployment, would provide crucial information for readers.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is factually correct, citing relevant sources to support its claims. However, it lacks scientific rigor as it doesn't involve experimentation or hypothesis testing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and relevant to the insurance industry. While the focus is on vendor resources, including citations from peer-reviewed journals on insurtech trends or the impact of claims management systems on insurance operations could strengthen the analysis.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is good. It's clear, concise, and professional, making it suitable for scholarly communication within the insurance domain.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Madan Mohan Tito Ayyalasomayajula**
Department, University & Country	**Aspen University, USA**