

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124861
Title of the Manuscript:	AI-Powered Information Governance: Balancing Automation and Human Oversight for optimal organization productivity
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 provides valuable insights into balancing AI automation with human oversight in the context of information governance, a critical topic for modern organizations. The mixed-methods approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data, strengthens the depth of analysis. The study is particularly important for the scientific community as it tackles the challenges of integrating AI while addressing key ethical issues such as data privacy, bias, and the need for transparency. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on real-world applications, using case studies and regression models to support its findings. However, more detailed discussions on specific challenges in smaller organizations and emerging markets could enhance its applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article, " AI-Powered Information Governance: Balancing Automation and Human Oversight for Optimal Organization Productivity ," is clear and reflects the core focus of the manuscript. However, it could be made more specific to highlight the ethical considerations and governance aspects that the article emphasizes. Suggested alternative title: "AI-Powered Information Governance: Balancing Automation, Human Oversight, and Ethical Challenges for Enhanced Organizational Efficiency." This title better captures the balance between automation, human roles, and the ethical dimensions discussed in the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the study's key elements, including the research focus, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from a few improvements to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Methodology Details: While the abstract briefly mentions quantitative and qualitative analyses, it would be helpful to specify key methods such as Pearson correlation, regression models, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This would give readers a clearer sense of the research approach.Key Results: The abstract could be more detailed in its presentation of the results. It mentions improvements in error reduction and compliance, but adding specific metrics or comparative results would strengthen the impact.Ethical Considerations: The abstract touches on ethical concerns like data quality and privacy but could better emphasize the ethical challenges in AI-powered information governance. This is a key part of the manuscript and should be highlighted more explicitly.Practical Implications: The abstract could briefly mention how the findings could be applied in real-world scenarios, offering practical recommendations or implications for organizations considering AI automation in governance. <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More details on the specific machine learning algorithms or data analysis techniques used.• Include quantitative findings such as the regression coefficients or SEM results to provide a clearer picture of the outcomes.• A stronger emphasis on the ethical implications and challenges of AI implementation, as this is crucial to the research. <p>Deletion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is no need to remove any sections, but some general statements could be made more specific, such as the mention of "significant improvements" in outcomes, by adding quantitative data.	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, as they follow a logical flow and effectively present the research. Here's an overview of why the structure works well and some suggestions for minor improvements:</p> <p>Strengths of the Structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Clear Introduction: The manuscript begins with a strong introduction that provides context on AI in information governance, making the research focus clear from the start.Literature Review: The inclusion of a detailed literature review helps establish the theoretical foundation for the study, which is important for framing the research questions.Methodology Section: The methodology is well-structured, providing clarity on the mixed-methods approach. It appropriately explains the use of quantitative techniques like Pearson correlation and SEM, as well as qualitative thematic extraction.Results and Discussion: These sections are clearly divided, presenting quantitative findings first and then discussing their implications. The inclusion of visual aids like tables and figures supports the analysis.Conclusion and Recommendations: The manuscript concludes with practical recommendations, which are useful for practitioners and organizations interested in applying AI in governance.	

Review Form 3

	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Subsections within Methodology: The methodology section could benefit from more clearly defined subsections to separate qualitative and quantitative analysis. For example, headings like "Quantitative Analysis" and "Qualitative Analysis" would enhance readability. Ethical Considerations: Given the importance of ethics in AI governance, it might be useful to include a dedicated subsection for "Ethical and Regulatory Challenges" instead of scattering ethical considerations throughout. This would give these crucial issues more prominence. Practical Implications Subsection: A dedicated subsection in the results or discussion titled "Practical Implications" would help clarify how the findings can be applied in real-world organizational contexts. <p>Overall:</p> <p>The manuscript's structure is solid, but adding more defined subsections and enhancing the visibility of the ethical and practical aspects of the research could improve the overall flow and make it more user-friendly.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodology, which combines both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The use of advanced statistical techniques, such as Pearson correlation, regression models, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), demonstrates a thorough approach to analyzing the relationships between AI automation, organizational size, and outcomes like error reduction and compliance improvement. Additionally, the qualitative thematic extraction from case studies enhances the depth of the analysis, providing real-world insights that validate the quantitative findings. The manuscript's consideration of ethical concerns, such as data privacy and bias, further strengthens its scientific validity by addressing the complex challenges associated with AI implementation in governance frameworks.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tarun Kumar Vashishth
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science and Applications, IIMT University, India