

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/>
Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

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

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 provides a robust framework for Continuous Data Quality Improvement (CDQI) within the context of Enterprise Data Governance (EDG). It is highly relevant to organizations aiming to address data quality challenges proactively, ensuring operational efficiency, regulatory compliance, and improved decision-making. The model's emphasis on integrating advanced technologies such as AI, real-time monitoring, and data stewardship is valuable in today's data-driven enterprises.	ok
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. No changes are recommended.	Noted
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, covering the purpose, methods, and implications of the proposed CDQI model. However, it would benefit from a concise mention of specific sectors or industries where the model has been successfully applied.	Effected revision
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with detailed methodologies and practical examples supporting its claims. The integration of real-world case studies strengthens its applicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and sufficient. However, incorporating more global perspectives could enhance the manuscript's diversity. Suggested additions: 1. Articles discussing CDQI applications in non-western or emerging markets. 2. Literature on integrating AI with data governance for niche industries such as renewable energy or microfinance.	Done
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication, though minor grammatical revisions could improve flow and readability.	

Review Form 3

Optional/General comments	Suggestions for Improvement	Revised
	<div><div>1.</div><div>Abstract: Include a line about specific industries benefiting from CDQI.</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Case Studies: Expand with examples from diverse sectors and geographies.</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Clarity: Review for minor grammatical errors, particularly in longer sentences.</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>Figures and Tables: Consider adding a summary table or flowchart to visually represent the CDQI framework for clarity.</div></div>	

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)	