

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_118632</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring the Concept of Explainable AI and Developing Information Governance Standards for Enhancing Trust and Transparency in Handling Customer Data</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community. It addresses critical issues surrounding Explainable AI (XAI) and robust information governance, which are essential for enhancing trust, transparency, and ethical use of customer data.</li> <li>2. The title of the article is suitable, and it accurately conveys the research scope.</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive. It provides a brief overview of the concerns regarding transparency, trust, and ethical data handling in AI systems, clearly states the purpose, discusses the methodology being used, and summarizes the key findings.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct; it provides a comprehensive literature review, clearly states the hypothesis and objectives, and uses a mixed-methods approach, providing a well-rounded examination of the topic. The manuscript also includes detailed empirical analysis and presents findings and recommendations.</li> <li>6. The manuscript includes a comprehensive list of references, and many references are from the last five years.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The language of this article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sneha Dingre
Department, University & Country	University of the Cumberlands, United States of America