

[Review Form](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_114807
Title of the Manuscript:	Leveraging AI for Enhanced Quality Assurance in Medical Device Manufacturing
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, I think the manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into quality assurance processes across various industries, highlighting its transformative potential in optimizing testing procedures and improving efficiency. It discusses key AI capabilities such as natural language processing, machine learning, and computer vision, and their applications in addressing the limitations of manual testing. By offering insights into how AI can revolutionize quality management systems, this manuscript is valuable for the scientific community, particularly professionals and researchers involved in quality assurance, software development, and AI technology.</p> <p>2. The title "Leveraging AI for Enhanced Quality Assurance in Medical Device Manufacturing" is suitable as it clearly conveys the main focus of the article, which is the utilization of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to improve quality assurance processes specifically within the context of medical device manufacturing. It accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the research topic. It clearly outlines the challenges faced in quality assurance processes within the medical device manufacturing sector, the potential benefits of integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies, and the specific AI techniques that can be employed to automate and optimize QA procedures. The abstract also highlights the advantages of AI-powered QA systems, such as real-time anomaly detection, proactive intervention, and adaptive learning capabilities. Overall, it effectively summarizes the key points of the research and gives readers a clear understanding of the focus and objectives of the study.</p> <p>4. The structure seems appropriate for addressing the topic of leveraging AI for enhanced quality assurance in medical device manufacturing.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Additional references are required to further support and contextualize the findings presented in the manuscript.</p>	<p>edited</p>

Review Form

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Based on the provided excerpt, the language and English quality of the article seem appropriate for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, precise, and employs technical terminology relevant to the field of geodesy and surveying. The article effectively conveys the purpose, methodology, results, and conclusions of the study, all of which are essential components of scholarly writing. Moreover, proper citation practices are observed, as demonstrated by the references cited within the text. Overall, the language and English quality meet the standards expected for scholarly publications in the relevant disciplines.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	