AI MANUSCRIPT REVIEW SYSTEM

Prakhar Mishra
Department of Computer Science & Engineering, BBDITM, Lucknow
prakhar131003@gmail.com

Kartikey Dwivedi
Department of Computer Science & Engineering, BBDITM, Lucknow
kartikeydwivedi11a@gmail.com

Himanshu Singh
Department of Computer Science & Engineering, BBDITM, Lucknow
heyhimanshu9125@gmail.com

Mr. Manuj Darbari
Professor, Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering, BBDITM, Lucknow

Abstract: The rapid growth of global research output has made traditional peer review increasingly time consuming, inconsistent, and prone to human bias. To address these challenges, this project introduces an AI based Manuscript Review System that automates key aspects of research paper evaluation using advanced Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Machine Learning (ML) techniques. The system analyse manuscripts for originality, linguistic quality, structural coherence, citation accuracy, and potential plagiarism, providing comprehensive and objective feedback to assist editors and reviewers.

Keywords: Manuscript submission and peer review work flow , Editorial decision management and reviewer assignment , Automated plagiarism detection and quality checks , Secure tracking, feedback, and publication management

I. INTRODUCTION

The world of academic publishing is evolving rapidly. Traditional peer review, while essential, often struggles with challenges such as reviewer fatigue, subjectivity, and delays in evaluating growing volumes of research. The AI-Based Manuscript Review System emerges as a transformative step toward a more intelligent, fair, and data-driven review process — one that understands not only what is written, but how effectively and ethically it communicates
scientific

This system integrates Artificial Intelligence, Natural Language Processing (NLP), Semantic Analysis, and Deep Learning to automate the critical components of research paper evaluation. It Analyse manuscripts for originality, clarity, logical structure, and citation accuracy, while also Detecting plagiarism and assessing writing quality. Much like the human reviewer interpret Meaning and coherence through experience, this AI model processes textual data through layers Of linguistic, contextual, and semantic understanding — ensuring consistent, objective, and highspeed evaluation

A key innovation of this project lies in its adaptive assessment mechanism. Instead of relying on Rigid rule-based checks, the system dynamically weighs multiple criteria such as novelty, Readability, and methodology strength based on the paper's domain and structure. This allows for More nuanced, context-aware feedback that mirrors expert evaluation while minimizing human Bias. The AI-Based Manuscript Review System represents a fusion of intelligence and academic Integrity — designed not just to evaluate, but to enhance. By combining automation with insight, It aims to make the publication process faster, more transparent, and more equitable, paving the Way for a future where technology empowers research excellence and accelerates the growth of Global scientific knowledge.

Scope of Manuscript Review System The AI-Based Manuscript Review System holds immense potential to transform how journals, Research institutions, and educators approach academic evaluation. By combining natural language Processing, semantic similarity analysis, and automated quality assessment, it moves far beyond Traditional manual reviewing — entering a new era of intelligent, data-driven manuscript Evaluation.

This system not only accelerates the review process but also enhances fairness, Consistency, and transparency across all stages of research assessment, setting a new standard for Integrity and innovation in scholarly publishing.

Academic Publishing and Journal Management Research journals and publishers can use the system to perform efficient initial manuscript Screening, assessing originality clarity of writing, and compliance with formatting and ethical Standards. Automated scoring then helps editors quickly prioritize high-quality submissions and Reduce overall reviewer workload. It also provides a consistent baseline assessment across all Incoming manuscripts. This ensures that only well-prepared and relevant papers move forward in The review process.

Universities and Research Institutions Research journals and publishers can use the system to perform efficient initial manuscript screening, assessing originality, clarity of writing, and compliance with formatting and ethical standards. Automated scoring then helps editors quickly prioritize high-quality submissions and reduce overall reviewer workload. It also provides a consistent baseline assessment across all incoming manuscripts. This ensures that only well-prepared and relevant papers move forward in

Funding and Grant Evaluation Funding agencies can employ the system to analyse research proposals for novelty, clarity, methodological rigor, and overall feasibility. The AI-base assessment offers a more balanced and data-driven evaluation process, supporting transparent decision-making in competitive funding

environments. It also helps identify proposals with strong potential impact early in the review cycle. By streamlining preliminary evaluation, the system allows human reviewers to focus on the most promising and innovative s**ubmissions**

A. Challenges in Existing Authentication Systems

1.Manual Processes: Submission and tracking are often handled manually. This causes delays and administrative burden. Overall workflow efficiency is reduced

2.Limited Transparency: Authors cannot easily track manuscript status. Communication gaps create uncertainty. Trust in the process may decrease.

3.Reviewer Matching Issues: Assigning suitable reviewers is challenging. Expertise and conflicts may be overlooked. This affects review quality and fairness

4.Inconsistent Reviews: No standard evaluation criteria in some systems. Feedback quality varies between users to upload and verify certificates with minimal technical knowledge. Effective information hierarchy, real-time feedback, and transparency in verification results improve user trust and system usability.

Theoretically, the proposed framework integrates decentralization, cryptographic security, intelligent verification, and user-centered design into a unified authentication ecosystem. By combining blockchain's immutability with AI's analytical intelligence, the system achieves secure, scalable, and viewers. Decisions may lack consistency.

5.Low Automation: Limited use of AI and smart tools. Plagiarism and analytics integration is weak. Efficiency and accuracy are affected.

B. The Rise of Intelligent Authentication Systems

1.Secure Author and Reviewer Verification: Intelligent authentication ensures verified user identities. Multi-factor and biometric methods reduce fraud. This protects the integrity of submissions.

2.Role-Based Access Control: Access is granted based on user roles. reviewers, and authors have defined permissions. This prevents unauthorized data access.

3.AI-Based Threat Detection: Systems monitor unusual login behaviour. Suspicious activities are flagged instantly. Real-time alerts enhance platform security**.**

4.Single Sign-On (SSO) Integration: Users can access multiple services securely. Reduces password fatigue and login issues. Improves user convenience and efficiency.

5.Data Protection and Encryption: Manuscripts and reviews are securely encrypted. Prevents data breaches and leaks. Ensures confidentiality throughout the review process.

C. Library and Repository Integration

Digital libraries and institutional repositories can implement the system for content validation, duplication detection, and quality assurance of uploaded research materials, ensuring data integrity and scholarly credibility. The platform help maintain consistent metadata standards and flags problematic or low-quality submissions before they enter the archive. It can also detect incomplete or improperly formatted documents early in the process. This strengthens the reliability and long-term value of institutional research collections.

D. Global Research Accessibility and Inclusion

By offering multilingual and domain-adaptive review capabilities, the system enables equitable access to high-quality evaluation services for researchers worldwide—especially those in developing regions with limited access to expert reviewers. It helps reduce language-related barriers and ensures that feedback remains relevant across diverse fields. The platform also promotes more inclusive participation in global scholarship. Ultimately, this contributes to a fairer and more accessible research ecosystem

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework for a Manuscript Review System is primarily rooted in the theory of scholarly communication and peer review. Peer review theory highlights the importance of expert evaluation in validating research quality, originality, and relevance before publication. It establishes the principles of objectivity, confidentiality, and accountability, which guide the design of the system. The manuscript review platform operationalizes these principles by structuring interactions among authors, reviewers, and editors within a controlled digital environment.

Information Systems Theory provides another foundational perspective. According to this theory, an effective system integrates people, technology, processes, and data to achieve organizational goals. A Manuscript Review System acts as a structured information processing environment where manuscripts are submitted, stored, evaluated, and archived. It ensures smooth data flow, reduces redundancy, and enhances communication efficiency among stakeholders. This theoretical approach supports the development of reliable databases, user interfaces, and reporting mechanisms.

The framework also draws from Workflow Management Theory, which focuses on automating sequential tasks and optimizing operational efficiency. In manuscript handling, multiple stages—submission, editorial screening, reviewer assignment, peer review, revision, and final decision—must follow a defined order. Workflow theory ensures that each stage is logically connected and systematically executed. Automation reduces manual errors, speeds up processing time, and improves transparency throughout the review lifecycle.

Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) Theory strengthens the system's security foundation. Since manuscript review involves confidential research data and blind review processes, access must be restricted according to user roles. Authors can upload and track submissions, reviewers can access assigned manuscripts, and editors can oversee the entire process. By clearly defining permissions, RBAC Problem Statemen ensures data protection, minimizes conflicts of interest, and maintains ethical standards

The theoretical framework is further supported by Quality Management Theory, particularly principles of Total Quality Management (TQM). These principles emphasize continuous improvement, standardized evaluation criteria, and performance monitoring. Within a Manuscript Review System, structured review forms, rating scales, and feedback templates promote consistency in evaluation. Performance metrics such as review turnaround time and decision accuracy help institutions maintain high publication standards.

Decision Support System (DSS) theory also contributes to the framework by assisting editors in making informed decisions. Manuscript evaluation often involves multiple criteria and reviewer comments, which can be complex to analyse manually. DSS tools provide summarized insights, comparative scoring, and recommendation support. This improves decision accuracy, reduces bias, and enhances transparency in the editorial process.

Additionally, Artificial Intelligence (AI) theories related to machine learning and natural language processing expand the system's capabilities. AI can assist in plagiarism detection, keyword extraction, reviewer recommendation, and preliminary manuscript screening. These intelligent tools enhance efficiency, minimize human workload, and increase the reliability of screening procedures. The integration of AI aligns with modern digital transformation trends in academic publishing.

Finally, the framework incorporates Ethical and Governance Theories, which stress fairness, transparency, and accountability in scholarly publishing. Blind and double-blind review models are grounded in ethical principles aimed at reducing bias. Clear audit trails, documentation of decisions, and conflict-of-interest declarations reinforce governance standards. Together, these theoretical perspectives create a comprehensive foundation for developing a secure, efficient, transparent, and high quality Manuscript Review System.

.III. RESEARCH GAP

Despite advances in AI-assisted peer review, most existing systems focus on isolated aspects such as plagiarism detection or language quality, without fully integrating multiple evaluation dimensions. They often rely on static datasets and rule-based scoring, limiting adaptability to manuscripts from diverse disciplines and research cultures. Feedback is typically generic, lacking nuanced assessments of scientific rigor, novelty, and clarity, while system decisions remain largely opaque and difficult to explain. Comprehensive real-world testing across different journals and research domains is still largely missing.

1.Fragmented Assessment of Manuscripts: Most tools evaluate only surface-level aspects like grammar or plagiarism, ignoring scientific rigor, novelty, and methodological strength. This results in incomplete assessments that miss deeper issues. Authors must rely on multiple disconnected tools.

2.Limited Domain Adaptability: AI systems often fail to adjust to different disciplines, study designs, or journal standards. This leads to irrelevant or inconsistent feedback. Without domain awareness, their evaluations lack precision and reliability.

3.Static Feedback Mechanisms: Many review tools provide fixed, generic comments that do not adapt to revisions or manuscript context. Feedback remains repetitive and shallow, offering little support for meaningful improvement over drafts.

4.Weak Integration of Content and Structure: Current systems focus on language errors but miss logical flow, argument clarity, and coherence between research components. This prevents holistic evaluation and leaves major scientific issues unaddressed.

5.Opaque Decision-Making: AI tools often act as black boxes, offering suggestions without clear reasoning. The lack of transparency reduces trust and makes it difficult for authors or editors to understand or validate their recommendations.

6.Lack of Interactive, Iterative Guidance: Most systems provide one-off evaluations instead of real time, step-by-step support. They cannot guide drafting or adapt to ongoing revisions, limiting their value in improving manuscripts over time.

IV. PROPOSED SYSTEM: THEORETICAL MAPPING AND DESIGN

In the contemporary scholarly publishing landscape, the efficiency, consistency, and fairness of the peer review process have become critical for ensuring high-quality research dissemination. However, the existing review process—whether conducted manually by human reviewers or with partial AI assistance—still relies heavily on subjective judgment, leading to inconsistencies, delays, and limited actionable feedback for authors. Traditional automated tools primarily focus on isolated tasks such as plagiarism detection, grammar correction, or citation checking, without evaluating broader aspects like scientific rigor, novelty, methodology, clarity, and ethical compliance, which are essential for a comprehensive assessment.

While some AI-based systems have attempted to support manuscript evaluation through rule-based scoring or language analysis, they lack an integrated, multimodal approach that considers content, structure, and scientific impact together. Furthermore, most current models fail to provide adaptive, context-sensitive feedback or explainable reasoning, leaving authors uncertain about specific areas for improvement. The challenge, therefore, lies in creating a system that can holistically evaluate manuscripts, integrating semantic understanding, methodological assessment, clarity of communication, and domain-specific standards in one coherent framework. The proposed system aims to address these limitations by building an AIassisted Manuscript Review System that provides data-driven, transparent, and constructive feedback, supporting authors, reviewers, and editors in improving manuscript quality efficiently and fairly.

4.1. Proposed Approach

The AI-Assisted Manuscript Review System integrates multiple AI disciplines—Natural Language Processing (NLP), Machine Learning, and Knowledge Representation—to analyse manuscripts comprehensively, assess scientific quality, and provide real-time, data-driven feedback. The system consists of five primary modules:

1.Preprocessing Module: Extracts and cleans manuscript content, including text, figures, and references, for AI analysis.

2.Plagiarism & Ethical Compliance Module: Checks for similarity with existing literature and flags ethical or citation issues.

3.Content & Scientific Quality Analysis Module: Evaluates novelty, methodology, logical flow, and result validity using NLP and machine learning.

4.Language & Style Evaluation Module: Assesses grammar, readability, clarity, and overall presentation, suggesting improvements.

5.Feedback & Explainability Module: Provides actionable, interpretable feedback, explaining the AI's assessment for transparency.

4.2. System Architecture

1. Frontend: Built using React.js, providing an interface for authors and editors to upload manuscripts and view AI-generated feedback.
2. Backend: Developed in Python (FastAPI + Flask), integrating TensorFlow and PyTorch models for NLP, machine learning, and knowledge-based analysis.
3. Databases: Uses MongoDB Atlas to store manuscript content, review logs, model outputs, and domain-specific reference data.
4. Processing Flow:

Manuscript upload → Preprocessing → Plagiarism & Ethical Check → Content & Scientific Quality Analysis → Language & Style Evaluation → Feedback Generation

4.3. Workflow of the System

1. The author logs into the platform and uploads a manuscript for review.

2.The system preprocesses the manuscript, extracting text, figures, tables, and references.

3.Each module (plagiarism check, content analysis, language evaluation) processes the manuscript

4.The AI evaluates scientific quality, novelty, methodology, clarity, and writing style in real time.

5.The AI generates a targeted feedback based on identified weaknesses or inconsistencies in the manuscript.

V. EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The expected outcome of implementing a Manuscript Review System is improved efficiency in the publication process. Automated workflows reduce manual tasks, minimize delays, and streamline communication between authors, reviewers, and editors. This leads to faster manuscript processing and timely editorial decisions.

Another key outcome is enhanced transparency and accountability. Authors can track the status of their submissions in real time, while editors can monitor reviewer performance and deadlines. Clear documentation of each stage ensures a structured and traceable review process.

An additional expected outcome is reduced administrative workload for editorial teams. Automated reviewer invitations, reminders, and deadline tracking minimize manual coordination efforts. This allows editors to focus more on quality evaluation rather than routine management tasks.

Improved quality of peer review is also anticipated. Standardized evaluation forms and structured feedback mechanisms promote consistency and fairness in manuscript assessment. This helps maintain high academic standards and strengthens the credibility of published research.

Data security and confidentiality are significant expected results. With role-based access control and secure data storage, sensitive research information remains protected. The system ensures that only authorized users can access specific content, preserving the integrity of the blind review process.

Additionally, better collaboration among stakeholders is expected. Integrated communication tools enable smooth interaction between authors, reviewers, and editors within a single platform. This reduces misunderstandings, enhances coordination, and promotes a more organized review environment.

Finally, the system is expected to support better decision-making and institutional growth. Analytical reports and performance metrics provide insights into review timelines, acceptance rates, and reviewer efficiency. These insights enable continuous improvement and contribute to a more reliable and professional scholarly publishing environment.

Expected Outcome	Description
Efficient Workflow Management	Automates submission and review processes.
Transparent Review Tracking	Enables real-time status monitoring.
Improved Review Quality	Ensures consistent and structured evaluation.
Secure Data Management	Protects manuscripts with secure access control.

Table 1. Expected Outcomes and Description

VI. Future Scope

Although the current prototype shows promising capabilities in automated manuscript evaluation, there remain several avenues for enhancement. Future development will explore advanced transformer-based architectures to better capture intricate relationships between content, argumentation, and writing style, enabling deeper and more context-aware assessments.

The system could also incorporate domain-specific adaptation, allowing it to adjust evaluation criteria based on research discipline, methodology, or journal standards. Implementing bias-mitigation and ethically-aligned AI frameworks will ensure fair and inclusive evaluations across diverse authors and research contexts.

The adaptive recommendation engine can be further refined using reinforcement learning or iterative feedback mechanisms, allowing the system to provide more personalized, targeted suggestions for improving manuscripts. Enhanced visualization tools, such as interactive dashboards, could track manuscript revisions over time and highlight improvements in clarity, methodological rigor, and overall quality.

Looking further ahead, integration with collaborative platforms could enable real-time interactions between authors, reviewers, and editors, fostering a more transparent, efficient, and iterative peer review process. Through continuous innovation, the AI-Assisted Manuscript Review System aims to evolve into a robust, intelligent, and trustworthy tool that enhances the efficiency, fairness, and overall quality of scholarly publishing.

VII. Conclusion

The proposed AI-Assisted Manuscript Review System offers a comprehensive framework for evaluating scholarly manuscripts by integrating multiple dimensions of assessment. Unlike traditional automated tools that focus narrowly on plagiarism or grammar, this system simultaneously examines scientific novelty, methodological rigor, clarity of communication, and ethical compliance to deliver a more holistic evaluation.

The system leverages advanced NLP models for semantic understanding, machine learning algorithms to assess research methodology and novelty, and style evaluation modules for readability and structural coherence. A fusion engine combines these metrics into a weighted scoring framework — Novelty (35%), Methodological Soundness (30%), Clarity & Presentation (20%), and Ethical Standards (15%) — producing detailed, actionable feedback tailored to each manuscript.

By offering adaptive recommendations, the platform guides authors through iterative improvements, helping to enhance both content quality and presentation. This approach not only increases the objectivity, consistency, and transparency of manuscript evaluation but also reduces reviewer bias and accelerates the peer review process. Ultimately, the system provides a next-generation solution for scholarly publishing, bridging the gap between automated analysis and human-level peer review expertise.

The modular design of the system ensures scalability and flexibility, allowing future integration of new AI models, domain-specific evaluation criteria, or real-time collaborative review features. It also supports explainable AI, providing clear reasoning behind each assessment and recommendation, which fosters trust among authors, reviewers, and editors. By combining automation with transparency and adaptability, the platform has the potential to streamline the peer review process, improve manuscript quality, and ultimately accelerate the dissemination of high impact research

VIII. REFERENCE

[1] Omar Haddad, Mohamed Nazih Omri,An Innovative Method for Improving Sentiment Analysis in Large Language Models, Procedia Computer Science, Volume 270, 2025, Pages 46054614, ISSN 1877-0509.

[2] Burmaoglu, S., Aravacik, E.D. & Soyler, A. Divergent priorities, convergent Goals: semantic analysis of publications and patents in healthcare smart contracts. Scientometrics (2025).

[3] Zekun Zhou, Xiaocheng Feng, Lei Huang, Xiachong Feng, Ziyun Song, Ruihan Chen, Liang Zhao, Weitao Ma, Yuxuan Gu, Baoxin Wang, Dayong Wu, Guoping Hu, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. 2025. From Hypothesis to Publication: A Comprehensive Survey of AI-Driven Research Support Systems. In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025, pages 11773–11803, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[4] Qiu, Yansheng & Zhang, Haoquan & Zhaopan, Xu & Li, Ming & Song, Diping & Wang, Zheng & Zhang, Kaipeng. (2025). AI Idea Bench 2025: AI Research Idea Generation Benchmark.

[5] Cao, Yuefan & Li, Xiaoyu & Liang, Yingyu & Sha, Zhizhou & Shi, Zhenmei & Song, Zhao & Zhang, Jiahao. (2025). Dissecting Submission Limit in Desk-Rejections: A Mathematical Analysis of Fairness in AI Conference Policies.

[6] A. T. A, C. Kumar, A. Amal and A. Kumar, "AI Academic Research Aggregator," 2025 3rd International Conference on Smart Systems for applications in Electrical Sciences (ICSSES), Tumakuru, India, 2025.

[7] X. Liang, X. Zhou, H. Zou, Y. Lu and J. Qu, "DeepDiveAI: Identifying AI-Related Documents in Large Scale Literature Dataset," in Journal of Social Computing, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 158-169, June 2025.

[8] Xie, Yutong & Pan, Yijun & Xu, Hua & Mei, Qiaozhu. (2024). Bridging AI and Science: Implications from a Large-Scale Literature Analysis of AI4Science.

[9] Rodafinos, Angelos. (2024). The Integration of Generative AI Tools in Academic Writing: Implications for Student.

[10] Paulo Henrique Couto, Quang Phuoc Ho, Nageeta Kumari, Benedictus Kent Rachmat, Thanh Gia Hieu Khuong, et al.. RelevAI-Reviewer: A Benchmark on AI Reviewers for Survey Paper Relevance. Cap 2024 – Conférence sur l'Apprentissage Automatique, Jul 2024, Lille, France.

[11] Silva, Anjalee & Wijekoon, Janaka & Liyanarachchi, Rashini &Panchendrarajan, Rrubaa & Rajapaksha, Weranga. (2024). AI Insights: A Case Study On Utilizing ChatGPT Intelligence for Research Paper Analysis.

[12] Glickman, Mark & Zhang, Yi. (2024). AI and Generative AI for Research Discovery and Summarization. Harvard Data Science Review.

[13] Lu, Chris & Lu, Cong & Lange, Robert & Foerster, Jakob & Clune, Jeff & Ha, David. (2024). The AI Scientist: Towards Fully Automated OpenEnded Scientific Discovery.

[14] Weber-Wulff, Debora & Anohina-Naumeca, Alla & Bjelobaba, Sonja & Foltýnek, Tomáš & Guerrero-Dib, Jean & Popoola, Olumide & Šigut, Petr & Waddington, Lorna. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. International Journal for Educational Integrity.

[15] Singh, Shashi & Kumar, Shubham & Mehra, Pawan. (2023). Chat GPT & Google Bard AI: A Review.

[16] Bahroun, Zied & Anane, Chiraz & Ahmed, Vian & Zacca, Andrew. (2023). Transforming Education: A Comprehensive Review of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Educational Settings through Bibliometric and Content Analysis.

[17] Leung TI, de Azevedo Cardoso T, Mavragani A, Eysenbach G. Best Practices For Using AI Tools as an Author, Peer Reviewer, or Editor. J Med Internet Res, 2023.

[18] Van Dijk, Sanne & Brusse-Keizer, Marjolein & Bucsán, Charlotte & Palen, Job & Doggen, Carine & Lenferink, Anke. (2023). Artificial intelligence in systematic Reviews: promising when appropriately used. BMJ Open.

[19] Rainy, Tahmina & Chowdhury, Abdur. (2022). THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WITHIN DIGITAL RETAIL SUPPLY CHAINS: A REVIEW OF STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING MODELS. American Journal of Scholarly Research and Innovation.

[20] Jardim, Patricia Sofia & Rose, Christopher & Ames, Heather & Meneses Echávez, José & Van de Velde, Stijn & Muller, Ashley (Ley). (2022). Automating Risk of bias assessment in systematic reviews: a real-time mixed methods comparison of human researchers to a machine learning system. BMC Medical Research