

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_104126
Title of the Manuscript:	Data Localization in India –A 360°view
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://journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/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</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but it could be more specific in the methodology description and in the results obtained.</p> <p>Yes, but there are several grammatical mistakes that must be resolved in the introduction section; we could find letters without spacing, lines where the final word has a number (maybe because of the copy paste behaviour) that doesn't belong to the reference. Use a IA grammatical corrector as a suggestion or pay for editorial and translation services. There are long paragraphs that could be divided in two or three at least for easiest reading, like page 5 paragraph. There are two types of line space format in some subtopics and some paragraphs have indentations that do not seem to correspond to the general editorial line. The Sub topic Sri Krishna committee report, the Article 29 of the law on the protection of personal data No, and the motivation behind the privacy law No, has several grammatical mistakes and lacks references in some of the paragraphs. In the Sensitive Personal Data there seems to be no justification in the numerical organisation of the information presented. The same issue regarding copy and paste from translation web pages seems to be highly present in page 17-19. Data localization: Pros and Cons section lacks any editorial work like subsequent pages.</p> <p>Section 8 about the hypothetical model seems to be relevant and innovative. So, authors could avoid much of the information in the introduction section and further describe more about the subject where authors have more knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>There is no evidence of the public policy suggestions in conclusion that is proposed in the introduction.</p> <p>Reference section also lacks an editorial or configuration process.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No	
<p>Optional/General 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:	Orlando Reynoso Orozco
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico