

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_119347
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Open Data in Driving Sectoral Innovation and Global Economic Development
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 <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article entitled "The Role of Open Data in Driving Sectoral Innovation and Global Economic Development", has fulfilled the terms and conditions from a research perspective, and the research results are useful for encouraging sectoral innovation and global economic development. 2. In my opinion, the title given to the article fulfills the research aspect, you only need to consider including the method used 3. Globally, the description presented in the abstract is still not specific, it is better if the description in the abstract is divided into the background of the problem to be researched, a description of the process using concepts, or comparative methods used in the research, and then a conclusion on the results obtained from the research. Further explanation is needed regarding the statement "The findings indicate that the availability of open data significantly increases innovation outputs, with robust statistical evidence showing positive correlations between open data sets and sector-specific innovation metrics such as patents filed, R&D expenditure, and the number of startups created", because this statement does not clearly and specifically describe the results obtained in research in order to increase research results, it is better to use a percentage value to show the results of good performance improvement compared to previous methods or research. 4. In my opinion, globally we still need a more specific explanation for each sub. For the writing structure, please look again at the written structure that has been determined. 5. In my opinion, the manuscript written is scientifically appropriate, it just needs further explanation regarding the data used and processed in the research carried out 6. The references provided are good, you only need comparative references from research that has been carried out by other researchers to be able to determine the novelty of the research carried out. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Please check again as a whole, especially the writing structure, thank you</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Chairuddi
Department, University & Country	Indonesia