

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_131024
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovative Approaches to Identity and Access Management for Enhancing Cybersecurity Compliance in Global Enterprises
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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 Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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 is a valuable contribution to the scientific community as it addresses the critical intersection of Identity and Access Management (IAM) and cybersecurity compliance in global enterprises. By exploring innovative IAM approaches and their integration with emerging technologies like AI, machine learning, and blockchain, the paper provides actionable insights for organizations navigating complex regulatory landscapes. The inclusion of real-world case studies and practical solutions enhances its relevance, offering a comprehensive guide for both researchers and practitioners aiming to strengthen cybersecurity frameworks. Overall, this work bridges the gap between theoretical research and practical implementation, making it a significant resource for advancing cybersecurity practices in an increasingly digital world.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 could briefly mention the role of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), and blockchain in shaping the future of IAM. This would provide a forward-looking perspective and highlight the potential for these technologies to revolutionize cybersecurity compliance.	Adjusted Abstract as per feedback
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The article occasionally relies on general phrases such as "this paper explores" and "this paper aims to provide" without deeply engaging with the specific methodology or results. In scholarly work, it's better to provide a more direct connection between research questions, methodologies, and outcomes. For instance, instead of simply stating what the paper aims to do, it would be more effective to highlight the specific contributions the paper makes to the field and how those insights are grounded in empirical data or case studies.</p>	<p>I appreciate the reviewer's feedback and agree that a clearer emphasis on methodology and specific contributions would enhance the abstract. The phrases "this paper explores" and "this paper aims to provide" were intended to offer a concise, broad summary of the paper's scope. However, I recognize the importance of explicitly stating how the research questions, methodologies, and outcomes are connected.</p> <p>In response, I would like to clarify that the paper makes several key contributions to the field, particularly by grounding its findings in empirical data from case studies and real-world applications. Specifically, the paper examines the implementation of IAM solutions—such as Single Sign-On (SSO), Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA), and automated user lifecycle management—within global enterprises, analyzing their impact on improving compliance and mitigating cybersecurity risks. These case studies provide concrete evidence of how IAM technologies can streamline access control and facilitate audit readiness, demonstrating the tangible outcomes of adopting these solutions.</p> <p>I believe these results, grounded in practical examples and data-driven analysis, directly address the research questions and contribute actionable insights to the field of cybersecurity compliance.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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)	