Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCOS_125798**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Enhancing Fraud Detection Systems through Advanced Data Engineering Techniques**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is definitely timely and relevant, as fraud detection has become an even more critical challenge for businesses/industries across the globe. The author's approach of proposing methods that can adapt to modern fraud schemes is definitely valuable. By addressing the limitations of traditional rule-based systems by offering a more dynamic approach, the manuscript adds significant value to dealing with fraud.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is apt and suitable, and captures the essence of the manuscript very well.	
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 reads too summarized. It will be beneficial for the readers if the abstract included key metrics that indicate the system's performance (e.g., reduction in false positives and faster detection). It would also be helpful to emphasize the novelty of the proposed approach more explicitly. Adding a sentence on the limitations or potential areas for future improvement would provide a well-rounded summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. The article is well organized and follows a clear structure.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, given its integration of established machine learning models and big data analytics frameworks. The authors have described the methodology clearly, and demonstrated significant improvements in fraud detection accuracy through the experiment results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references appear sufficient and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	There are minor grammatical errors throughout the manuscript, such as: *"Fraud remains one of the most daunting issues facing businesses and many organizations across such sectors like banking, insurance, e-commerce and healthcare"* Instead of "like" it should be "as" and there is a comma missing before "and". Although minor, addressing such errors would significantly improve the quality of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript requires minor revisions to correct grammatical errors. Otherwise, the manuscript is great – the research appears to be sound and the framework presented could significantly contribute to the field of fraud detection.	

	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:	**Pranav Khare**
Department, University & Country	**USA**