

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_118632
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Concept of Explainable AI and Developing Information Governance Standards for Enhancing Trust and Transparency in Handling Customer Data
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1</p> <p>The importance of a manuscript for the scientific community depends on various factors, including its content, relevance, and potential impact. Without specific details about the manuscript in question, I can provide a general perspective. Scientific manuscripts play a crucial role in advancing knowledge and understanding within their respective fields.</p> <p>2. Yes 3. yes 4. yes</p> <p>5. Assessing scientific correctness requires domain-specific expertise. However looks good 6.</p> <p>Sufficiency of References: The sufficiency of references depends on the depth and breadth of the research. A well-researched manuscript typically includes references to relevant prior work, foundational studies, and recent research. Consider whether the references cover a diverse range of perspectives and contribute to the overall understanding of the topic.</p> <p>Recency of References: While it's essential to cite foundational work, recent references are valuable for staying up-to-date with the field. Look for references published within the last 5–10 years, especially if they address recent advancements or changes in the field.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions: If you're reviewing the manuscript and find that certain aspects are not adequately supported by references, consider suggesting additional sources.</p> <p>Look for recent review articles, authoritative</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Scholarly articles should use clear and precise language to convey complex ideas. Avoid ambiguity, jargon, or overly convoluted sentences. Ensure that the writing is straightforward and easy to follow. Complex concepts should be explained logically.</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: Proper grammar, syntax, and sentence structure are essential. Errors can distract readers and undermine the credibility of the research.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Archana Balkrishna Yadav
Department, University & Country	Gujarat Technological University, India