

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
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 <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 addresses a critical comparative analysis of two leading claims management solutions in the insurance industry, providing valuable insights into their respective architectures, functionalities, and industry adoption. This is a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in insurance technology, aiding insurers in making informed decisions about platform selection. The findings, particularly regarding scalability and regulatory compliance, are relevant for digital transformation initiatives in the insurance sector.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is clear and reflects the content accurately. However, a slight refinement can make it more engaging.  Suggested alternative: A Comparative Study of Guidewire ClaimCenter and Duck Creek Claims: Architectural Insights and Industry Adoption	
<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>	The abstract is well-structured and provides a clear summary of the manuscript. However, including the specific evaluation metrics (e.g., scalability, deployment) and the comparative framework in more detail would enhance clarity.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust. The comparative methodology is clearly outlined, and the use of case studies and third-party validation strengthens the reliability of findings.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a broad range of primary sources, including product documentation, industry reports, and case studies. Authors Should Follow Journal Standard and add some references from reputed journals. However, adding a few peer-reviewed journal articles would further enhance the academic rigor.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript's language is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, a few sentences in the introduction and methodology sections could benefit from refinement to improve clarity and flow.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider adding a visual comparison table or framework summarizing the key differences between Guidewire ClaimCenter and Duck Creek Claims.</li> <li>2. A brief discussion on the potential future trends in claims management systems, particularly with AI and ML integration, would add value.</li> <li>3. Please Refer Proper guidelines</li> <li>4. Expand the methodology section with more details on how qualitative and quantitative data were integrated.</li> <li>5. Ensure all tables and figures have proper captions and are referenced in the text.</li> </ol>	

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>M.B. Fathima Sanjeetha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>South Eastern University, Sri Lanka</b>