

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>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community for several reasons:</p> <p>Yes, is generally suitable, as it accurately reflects the core themes and objectives of the research. However, it could be refined for clarity and conciseness.</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>4. Need some clarity</p> <p>5. Clear Research Objectives and Hypotheses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study should clearly state its research objectives and hypotheses. The objectives mentioned in the introduction are clear and relevant to the topic. <p>6.yes The manuscript tackles significant concerns regarding the transparency, trust, and ethical use of AI systems. The study emphasizes the importance of ethical data handling and robust information governance. The mixed-methods approach, combining a literature review with a survey, provides empirical evidence to support the study's claims.</p> <p>4. Information Governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition and significance. Standards and best practices. <p>Role in data security and compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity, conciseness, and academic rigor could be improved. Here are some specific observations and recommendations to enhance the language quality of the manuscript:</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>Repetition:</p> <p>Example: "The lack of transparency in AI systems can lead to mistrust among users, which can hinder the adoption and effectiveness of AI technologies."</p> <p>Improvement: Reduce redundancy. Instead of repeating similar points, consolidate the information to make the text more concise.</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:	Somashekhar B M
Department, University & Country	Amrita Vishwa VidyaPeetham Mysuru, India