

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_131417
Title of the Manuscript:	Automated Claims Processing in Guidewire ClaimCenter: Enhancing Efficiency and Accuracy in the Insurance Industry
Type of the Article	Research Article (Empirical Study) with elements of a Technical Review and Case Study Analysis.

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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 of high relevance to the scientific and insurance technology communities because it gives an empirical evaluation of automated claims processing using Guidewire Claim Center. The study contributes to the growing field of AI-driven insurance automation, offering insights into how digital transformation enhances efficiency, fraud detection, and customer experience. The inclusion of real-world case studies strengthens the practical applicability of the research, making it useful for both academics and industry professionals. Furthermore, the discussion on future trends, such as AI, IoT, and blockchain in insurance, ensures that this manuscript remains a valuable resource for future studies on digital transformation in financial services.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and informative, but it could be more precise and engaging. Since the manuscript highlights AI-driven automation, the title could reflect this aspect better. Suggested Alternative Titles: 1. "AI-Powered Claims Automation in Guidewire ClaimCenter: Transforming Efficiency and Fraud Detection in Insurance" 2. "The Impact of AI-Driven Claims Processing in Guidewire ClaimCenter on Insurance Efficiency and Accuracy" 3. "Revolutionizing Insurance with Automated Claims Processing: A Case Study on Guidewire ClaimCenter"	Noted

Review Form 3

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.	Comprehensive, but could be improved. Suggested Additions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The abstract should mention any limitations of the study (e.g., challenges in AI integration, workforce adaptation).2. A clearer breakdown of key results (e.g., numerical improvements in fraud detection and claim settlement times).3. A mention of future research directions, such as regulatory implications or ethical considerations in automated claims. Suggested Deletions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Some parts of the abstract repeat information from the conclusion. It can be made more concise without losing critical insights.	Noted. Challenges and key results were added to the abstract and highlighted. Future research directions including regulatory and ethical considerations were added and highlighted.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct because it is based on empirical case studies, industry reports, and Guidewire documentation. Areas to Strengthen: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The discussion on AI-driven fraud detection should acknowledge potential biases in automated claim assessment.2. More emphasis on regulatory compliance in different jurisdictions would improve the scientific rigor.3. Ensure that technical explanations of AI, IoT, and blockchain remain accessible to readers from both academia and industry.	Noted. Enhanced the discussion on AI-driven fraud detection in Future Trends and Research Directions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and relevant, but some areas may be improved. Improvement Suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Some references such as company whitepapers are not peer-reviewed. Academic papers related to AI in insurance claims processing would add value to the manuscript.2. Research published in 2023–2025 may be included, particularly those concerning AI-driven insurance automation from the following journals:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Journal of Risk and Insurance• The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance• AI & Society (Springer) Potential Additional References: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A paper on bias in AI-driven insurance automation to discuss ethical concerns.2. A study on blockchain in claims management to expand on transparency aspects.3. A comparative analysis of Guidewire vs. other claims automation platforms.	Noted. Updated References.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication , but some sentences are long and complex. Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Break down long sentences for better readability.• Improve grammatical consistency (e.g., articles like “a” and “the” are sometimes missing).• Some technical jargon could be simplified for a broader audience.	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Consider adding more visual elements (e.g., flowcharts or bar graphs) to illustrate key trends in automation.2. Discussion on AI limitations should be expanded, particularly regarding bias, cybersecurity risks, and ethical concerns.3. Future research directions should be mentioned—how can AI-driven claims processing be further optimized?4. The conclusion could briefly acknowledge the challenges of implementation while reinforcing the benefits of automation.	Noted. Added future research directions and the revisions are highlighted. Key AI limitations were added and highlighted.

Review Form 3

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)	