

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_116237
Title of the Manuscript:	Artificial intelligence, Big Data, and Cloud infrastructures: policy recommendations for enhancing women's participation in the Tech-Driven Economy
Type of the Article	

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> <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>	<p>1. Key findings from the study include: <input type="checkbox"/> a. The type of organization and specific tech sectors significantly influence the barriers experienced by women. b. Gender diversity within teams correlates strongly with improved innovation and performance. c. Gender-inclusive policies substantially increase women's participation in tech roles, particularly when these policies are applied long-term. This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it contributes to the understanding of gender disparities in critical technological sectors. It offers evidence-based recommendations for enhancing the integration of women into these fields, which is crucial for driving innovation, performance, and inclusive economic growth. The research underscores the need for strategic policy-making and organizational change to foster an inclusive tech environment that addresses these disparities effectively.</p> <p>2. The title of the article, "Artificial Intelligence, Big Data, and Cloud Infrastructures: Policy Recommendations for Enhancing Women's Participation in the Tech-Driven Economy," seems suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus and content of the article. It succinctly mentions the key technological areas (AI, Big Data, Cloud Infrastructures) and clearly states the article's aim (enhancing women's participation) along with the specific action (policy recommendations). If an alternative title is needed, it might be beneficial to emphasize the aspect of addressing gender disparities, for example: "Bridging Gender Gaps in Technology: Strategic Policies for Women's Inclusion in AI, Big Data, and Cloud Sectors". This alternative title highlights the goal of reducing gender gaps and emphasizes the strategic nature of the policy recommendations, making it clear that the article is focused on actionable strategies within specific high-tech fields.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive. It succinctly outlines the research problem, methodology, key findings, and recommendations, covering the main aspects of the study which investigates the underrepresentation of women in AI, Big Data, and Cloud infrastructures. The abstract provides specific details about the quantitative methods used, the survey's response rate, and the regression analysis applied to test the hypotheses. It highlights significant results about barriers women face in tech, the effects of diverse teams on innovation, the role of educational programs, and the impact of gender-inclusive policies. Finally, it proposes actionable recommendations for promoting gender diversity within the tech industry. This detailed overview in the abstract allows readers to understand the scope and implications of the research without delving into the full article, effectively summarizing the study's intent, approach, findings, and the strategic importance of the outcomes.</p> <p>4. The document is structured into distinct sections including the Introduction, Literature Review, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations, each serving a clear purpose.</p> <p>5. The manuscript seems to demonstrate a robust scientific approach, particularly through its quantitative research methods and multiple regression analysis to test hypotheses regarding barriers to entry, advancement, inclusivity of educational programs, and effectiveness of gender-inclusive policies in tech-related roles for women. These methods are well-regarded in the scientific community for their ability to provide objective, data-driven insights. The research hypotheses were systematically tested, and results are provided with significant statistical values, suggesting a strong scientific framework underpinning the study. The findings, such as the correlation between gender diversity and improved innovation and performance, are backed by rigorous data analysis, enhancing the scientific validity of the manuscript. Additionally, the conclusions drawn from the data appear to be well-supported by the results, which align with the established literature on the subject, further affirming the manuscript's scientific correctness.</p> <p>6. The references in the manuscript are substantial and up-to-date, covering a wide range of relevant and authoritative sources. These include peer-reviewed journals, credible research reports, and significant academic studies, ensuring that the manuscript is well-supported by contemporary literature in the field of gender diversity and technology. Given the manuscript's focus on gender inclusivity in tech-driven economies, it might also benefit from including additional studies that address similar themes in different cultural or economic contexts, potentially offering a broader or more comparative perspective. You could consider adding sources that focus on emerging markets or studies that analyze the impact of technological advancements on gender roles globally, which</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	might enhance the depth and relevance of the discussion in your manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript are described as "clear and well-written," suitable for scholarly communication. The document provides a detailed assessment of gender diversity in AI, Big Data, and Cloud Infrastructures, supported by substantial data and references. It adheres to academic norms in structure and language, which is important for scholarly readers and reviewers.	
Optional/General 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:	Deng Kai
Department, University & Country	Hubei University of Medicine, China