Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_129819**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Continuous Data Quality Improvement in Enterprise Data Governance: A Model for Best Practices and Implementation**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

<mark>**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**</mark>

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **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 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 great importance to the scientific community as it addresses a critical challenge in modern data management: ensuring continuous data quality improvement within enterprise data governance frameworks. The proposed model provides a structured approach that organizations can adopt to proactively address data quality issues such as inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and redundancies, which can hinder decision-making and operational efficiency.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title, *"Continuous Data Quality Improvement in Enterprise Data Governance: A Model for Best Practices and Implementation,"* is suitable as it effectively conveys the manuscript's focus on continuous improvement in data quality within the framework of enterprise data governance. It clearly indicates the manuscript's objective to present a model, best practices, and implementation strategies.	Done revision
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 comprehensive and effectively summarizes the manuscript's core ideas, including the importance of Continuous Data Quality Improvement (CDQI), its integration into enterprise data governance, and the use of advanced technologies like AI and real-time monitoring. It also highlights key components such as best practices, governance alignment, and phased implementation strategies.	OK
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It is grounded in established principles of data governance and quality management, and it integrates contemporary approaches such as the use of artificial intelligence (AI), real-time monitoring, and machine learning for addressing data quality issues. The manuscript also incorporates well-structured frameworks, practical strategies, and real-world case studies that enhance its scientific rigor and applicability. The inclusion of key metrics, such as accuracy, completeness, and timeliness, aligns with industry standards for assessing data quality. The manuscript also emphasizes on iterative improvement, a foundational concept in both quality management and governance practices.	Effected
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and recent, as they include citations from 2024, indicating up-to-date research contributions. The references also cover a wide range of relevant topics, such as data governance frameworks, continuous data quality improvement, and the use of AI and machine learning in data management.	Noted

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the manuscript meets the standards of scholarly communication, but slight improvements in sentence structure and consistency could elevate its readability and impact.	
Optional/General comments		

<mark>**PART 2:**</mark>

	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)*	