

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_131189
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Data Science in Improving Healthcare Access and Equity
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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>
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 highly relevant to the scientific community as it addresses the transformative role of data science in healthcare, particularly in enhancing access and equity. By integrating predictive analytics, artificial intelligence, and machine learning, the paper highlights data-driven strategies to identify disparities and optimize interventions. The discussion on algorithmic bias and fairness-aware AI models is particularly important for ensuring ethical and equitable healthcare solutions. Furthermore, the emphasis on collaboration between policymakers, healthcare providers, and data scientists makes this work a valuable resource for interdisciplinary research and policy formulation.	Accepted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title effectively captures the core focus of the manuscript.	Accepted
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 well-structured and provides a clear summary of the paper. However, it could benefit from explicitly mentioning the methodologies used in the study and summarizing key findings more concisely. Additionally, a brief mention of policy implications or real-world applications would strengthen its impact.	The methodology is from previous existing and the authors see no need to repeat such.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate and well-supported by relevant literature. The integration of concepts such as geospatial analytics, predictive modeling, and fairness-aware AI aligns with current research trends. However, it would be beneficial to include more empirical evidence or case studies to reinforce the claims made in the discussion	Case study added
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive and include recent studies, particularly from 2016 to 2024. However, incorporating more recent case studies or real-world applications of AI-driven healthcare interventions (e.g., AI in COVID-19 response, recent advancements in bias mitigation techniques) could enhance the paper’s depth. A few references on regulatory frameworks governing AI in healthcare would also be useful.	accepted

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written, with a scholarly tone suitable for academic discourse. However, minor grammatical refinements and clearer transitions between sections could improve readability. The technical jargon is appropriate for a scientific audience, though defining complex terms for interdisciplinary readers may be beneficial.	accepted
Optional/General comments	The paper effectively discusses algorithmic bias but could include more concrete strategies for mitigating biases beyond diverse data representation. A section elaborating on real-world case studies or successful implementations of data-driven healthcare policies would strengthen the paper. The discussion on ethical considerations is strong, but adding specific regulatory guidelines or frameworks would improve its practical relevance.	Comments accepted but the authors don't want to go outside the writing technics based on "specific regulatory guidelines or frameworks would improve its practical relevance."

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)	