

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124861
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>AI-Powered Information Governance: Balancing Automation and Human Oversight for optimal organization productivity</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	This manuscript presents an important discussion on the balance between AI automation and human oversight in the context of information governance, highlighting the significant benefits of AI while acknowledging its potential risks. The study's relevance is underscored by the increasing adoption of AI in high-risk sectors like financial services and healthcare, where governance frameworks are critical for compliance and ethical decision-making. I like this manuscript because it provides a thorough examination of both the advantages and challenges of AI in organizational productivity and governance, and it contributes to the ongoing conversation about the need for human oversight in AI systems.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it reflects the core focus of the manuscript. However, a more concise alternative could be: "Balancing AI Automation and Human Oversight in Information Governance for Optimal Productivity."	
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 mostly comprehensive, but it could benefit from emphasizing the empirical results more clearly, such as the positive correlation between AI automation, organization size, and adoption duration. Additionally, the mention of transparency and human oversight could be briefly elaborated.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure are appropriate and follow a logical flow. The use of empirical data, supported by thematic analysis and literature references, is well integrated throughout the manuscript.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of statistical methods, including correlation and regression analysis, is appropriate for the research objectives. The integration of human oversight into AI governance models is well-grounded in both the literature and the study's findings. Moreover, the identification of risks such as bias and privacy concerns aligns with current research in the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are adequate, and the manuscript draws from recent and relevant literature. However, adding a few more recent studies (from 2022–2024) on human-AI collaboration and ethics in AI could further strengthen the context, particularly in sectors like healthcare and finance.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is clear and appropriate for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical adjustments could improve readability in some sections. The authors should consider revising sentences that are overly long or complex.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is well-researched and contributes meaningfully to the topic of AI-powered information governance. The authors have done a commendable job of balancing the technical aspects with ethical considerations. Expanding the section on practical applications or case studies could further enhance its impact.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Akinbusola Olushola</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA</b>