

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125675
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Future of Work: A Human-Centric Approach to AI, Robotics, and Cloud Computing</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Empirical</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript addresses critical themes at the intersection of technology and the workforce, highlighting both the benefits and challenges posed by the rapid adoption of AI, robotics, and cloud computing. Its mixed-method approach, utilizing robust data from reputable sources, enhances its credibility and provides valuable insights into adoption trends and productivity gains across different regions. Importantly, the focus on ethical challenges, particularly algorithmic bias and job displacement, emphasizes the need for responsible AI governance and workforce reskilling, which are crucial for sustainable technological advancement. I appreciate the manuscript's balanced perspective on both the positive and negative implications of these technologies, which is vital for informing policymakers and industry leaders about the necessary steps to mitigate risks while maximizing benefits.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>They are appropriate</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive mixed-method approach, combining quantitative data analysis with qualitative sentiment analysis. The use of well-established datasets from reputable sources, such as the OECD AI Policy Observatory and Pew Research Center, lends credibility to its findings and ensures that the results are grounded in reliable information. The application of K-Means clustering for technology adoption analysis reflects a solid methodological framework, allowing for meaningful comparisons across industries and regions. Furthermore, the manuscript's clear articulation of the correlation between algorithmic bias sentiment and reported violations, coupled with a focus on GDPR compliance, underscores its technical soundness by addressing both empirical evidence and ethical considerations in AI governance.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes, references are sufficient and recent</p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical errors are to be corrected	
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Reepu
Department, University & Country	Chandigarh University, India