

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics - Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1891
Title of the Manuscript:	Generative Artificial Intelligence: A new Tactic to perform Banking Operations
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

Review Form 2

PART 1: Review Comments

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community because it explores the practical applications of Generative AI in the banking sector. It provides a clear overview of how these technologies can be used to improve various banking operations, from loan processing to marketing and debt collection. This information is particularly relevant as the banking industry continues to embrace AI solutions. I find the manuscript to be a good starting point for understanding the potential of Generative AI in banking. However, it lacks depth in some areas. For example, it could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the challenges and ethical considerations associated with implementing these technologies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Generative Artificial Intelligence: A new Tactic to perform Banking Operations," is suitable. It accurately reflects the manuscript's focus on Generative AI and its applications in banking.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the manuscript's content. However, it could be strengthened by adding a brief mention of the limitations and challenges associated with using Generative AI in banking. This would provide a more balanced perspective.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The logical flow of information makes it easy to follow.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates a good understanding of Generative AI and its potential applications in banking. The use of figures and diagrams helps to visualize the concepts and processes discussed. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more rigorous analysis of the specific algorithms and techniques used in each application.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. However, the manuscript could benefit from including additional references that address the ethical considerations and challenges associated with using Generative AI in banking.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors and instances of awkward phrasing. A thorough proofreading would improve the overall readability.	
Optional/General comments	Proofreading: A thorough proofreading is recommended to address minor grammatical errors and improve the overall flow of the text. Depth of Analysis: Consider expanding the discussion of specific algorithms and techniques used in each application. Ethical Considerations: Include a section or discussion on the ethical considerations and challenges associated with using Generative AI in banking. Limitations: Acknowledge the limitations of Generative AI in banking and discuss potential solutions or future research directions.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramakrishnan Neelakandan
Department, University & Country	United States of America