



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “AI-enhanced Low-Code and Multi-agent frameworks for Healthcare Digital Transformation in the Western Balkans”

Submitted: 03 August 2026

Accepted: 15 September 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Corresponding Author: Hiqmet Kamberaj

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p22

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniel B. Hier

Missouri University of Science and Technology, USA

Reviewer 2: Nazmun Nahar Chaittee

Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear, specific, and accurately reflects the main focus of the manuscript. In my view it is adequate to the content and does not require modification.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract clearly states the objectives, briefly describes the methods, and summarizes the main results and conclusions. It is appropriate and consistent with the body of the manuscript

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the manuscript. A careful proofreading (or copy-editing pass) is recommended before publication.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are described clearly enough to understand the proposed framework and its intended use.

Additional Comment:

One point that would improve clarity, especially for readers without an informatics background, is a brief early definition of what you mean by a “low-code framework/platform.” For example, you could state that you use “low-code” to refer to visual, drag-and-drop development environments with pre-built components that allow users with limited programming experience to assemble workflows and interfaces, with optional hand-coding for advanced logic. Adding 1–2 sentences along these lines in the Introduction or Methods would make the methodology more accessible.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are presented clearly and appear internally consistent with the described methods; I did not identify obvious errors. A careful edit to reduce length and remove some redundancy would further improve readability

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Agree, Conclusions reflect the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the Introduction (or Methods), please add a concise, formal definition of a low-code framework and cite one or two authoritative sources, so readers understand precisely what category of tools you are analyzing (e.g., “platforms that enable rapid application delivery with minimal hand-coding via visual modeling and configuration rather than traditional programming.
