

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofResearchinComputerScience
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJRCOS_124861
TitleoftheManuscript:	AI-PoweredInformationGovernance:BalancingAutomationandHumanOversightforoptimalorganizationproductivity
TypeoftheArticle	

PART1: ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISIONcomments	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback (Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)
<p>Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportanceofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo(youlike(ordislike)thismanuscript?Aminimumof3-4sentencesmayberequiredforthispart.</p>	<p>Thestudyadoptsamixed-methodsapproachtointervestigatebalancebetweenAI-poweredautomationandhumanoversightininformationgovernanceframeworksto enhanceorganisationalproductivity,efficiency,and compliance.Quantitativedatafrom384respondentswerequalitativelyanalysedusingPearsoncorrelation, regressionmodels,andStructuralEquationModeling(SEM)toexaminetherelationshipbetweenAIautomation levels,organisationsize,andAIadoptionduration.</p>	
<p>Isthethetitleofthearticlesuitable?</p>	<p>Yes,itsbrief,properandrelatedtothemanuscript.</p>	
<p>Istheabstractofthearticlecomprehensive?Doyousuggesttheadition(ordelation)ofsomepointsinthissection?Pleasewriteyoursuggestionshere.</p>	<p>Theabstractmustbemoretransparentandcomprehensive,presentingthefindingsandmethodology.This willsignificantlyaidreadersinunderstandingthemanuscript.</p>	
<p>Are subsectionsandstructureofthemanuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes,butsomesections,such assections2 to6, canmerge.</p>	
<p>Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingthescientificcorrectnessofthismanuscript.Whydoyouthinkthatthismanuscriptisscientificalllyrobustandtechnically sound?Aminimumof3-4sentencesmayberequired forthispart.</p>	<p>Themethodologyis qualitativelybased,andthe issueofthestudyisnew.</p>	
<p>Arethereferencesufficientandrecent?Ifyouhavesuggestionsofadditionalreferences,pleasemention theminthereviewform.</p>	<p>Yes,it'ssuitableandnew.</p>	
<p>MinorREVISIONcomments</p> <p>Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable forscholarlycommunications?</p>	<p>Affirmative.</p>	

ReviewForm3

Optional/General comments

The manuscript's lack of consistent paragraphing, often resulting in lengthy paragraphs of over ten lines and 120 words, significantly hampers the review process.

2. The abstract must be more transparent and comprehensive, particularly in presenting the findings and methodology. This will significantly aid readers in understanding the manuscript.
3. The 'introduction' should serve as a platform to explain the research gap, and the target audience rather than focusing solely on the main objectives. This will help to set the stage for the rest of the manuscript.
4. The entire manuscript suffers from many dictation errors; try to rectify them.
5. Citations must be at the end of sentences; try to follow them.
6. Bulleting the entire manuscript has errors; try to resolve all of them.
7. Figures must be enumerated in the entire manuscript.
8. The section "finding" contains objectives 2 and 3, but it does not include objective 1. Please clarify this.
9. The discussion must include the author's ideas and arguments, and it is not recommended to use other references.

The "Conclusion" section address three main issues: the main findings, the limitations of the studies, and the drives of future studies; try to clarify these issues in the "conclusion" section.

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:	Seyed Behbood Issa-Zadeh
Department, University & Country	Madrid Polytechnic University, Spain