

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_127573
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancing Information Governance in AI-Driven Cloud Ecosystem: Strategies for Enhancing Data Security and Meeting Regulatory Compliance
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses a very relevant current issue by laying down a structured framework to determine governance in the context of AI-driven cloud environments, integrating key governance components such as PET, ethical oversight, and incident response metrics, which are critical in terms of mitigating risks and enhancing compliance. The study specifically identified industry-specific vulnerabilities underpinning retail and technology and that is something which is currently being prioritized in the challenges in cloud and AI governance. These aspects give the manuscript an important contribution to the already existing body of research concerning safe and ethical practices in cloud computing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Governance Framework Evaluation for AI-Driven Cloud Environments," is suitable and reflects the manuscript's scope effectively. However, consider enhancing clarity by specifying the inclusion of SEM analysis and PETs, e.g., "A Governance Framework for AI-Driven Cloud Environments: Insights from SEM Analysis and Privacy-Enhancing Technologies."	
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 is comprehensive but could be improved by emphasizing key quantitative results, such as the significance of incident response metrics ($\beta = 0.51, p < 0.001$) and the role of PETs ($\beta = 0.25, p = 0.001$). Including the model fit indices (e.g., RMSEA and CFI values) would provide a clearer overview of the study's robustness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured in terms of clearly defined sections for results, discussion, and recommendation. However, subheadings may be a little shorter and more meaningful to enhance readability on the discussion part.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript is scientifically robust, while keeping its focus on ascertaining governance aspects, the manuscript has utilized SEM with other advanced methodologies. The data are well analyzed; hence the findings are statistically supported. The focus on PETs and the industry-specific governance challenges is unique, in keeping with prevailing trends and regulatory needs.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. However, consider adding sources on emerging PETs and evolving AI governance practices from 2023–2024 to enrich the discussion further. For instance, you may include literature on PET implementation challenges or case studies on AI-cloud compliance.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Improve the language quality by addressing minor grammatical inconsistencies. Enhance the discussion of limitations to provide a balanced view of the study's findings. Ensure all figures and tables are well-labeled and captioned for clarity.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chhavi Jain
Department, University & Country	Sharda University, India