

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_123396
Title of the Manuscript:	AI at the Crossroads: Contrasting Digital Economies in Europe and Africa
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The paper's composition is coherent; the structure is logical and meets the goal of the paper. The topic sounds very interesting. All the tools and methods the author uses are reasonable and well described and adequately fit the problem being assessed to give the reliable results. Conclusions are related to the results presented before reflecting the assessed issue at a professional level. However major revision would suffice to get the manuscript published in the journal. It is recommended that the authors make a relatively <u>major revision</u> according to the specific amendments to the text	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title " AI at the Crossroads: Contrasting Digital Economies in Europe and Africa " puts well the paper's objective; it is clear and expresses the issue being assessed very well.	
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 formulated adequately along with the true picture of the paper. However, in abstract to underline the methods used, added value, purpose and ways of application of the research results is recommended.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some rearrangement regarding the section's contents could be made. The Methodology and Discussion sections are missing and should be added to the manuscript. It's recommended that the Recommendation section is to be supplemented with the Discussion section.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Introduction part I recommend mentioning the purpose and ways of application of the research results in the practice bringing up any benefits and added value with expressing the research gap, along with the way it can be filled in by your research output. - Please specify the originality and relevance of the topic in the field of International Economics and Economic Development. - It is recommended that the authors summarize the contribution points of the method proposed in this article in the introduction part of the article to highlight the research advantages of this article along with the brief outline of the paper. - The Methodology part is missing, the research methods and their application should be explained and outlined. - Discussion section is missing. It should be focused on some kind of polemic discourse comparing the research outcomes with the literature overview part that would be beneficial to be involved in Discussion. - Conclusion section could be provided with some views for practice and action based on the research outcomes as well as a final statement reflecting the assessed issue along with the way how the research results could be implemented in the practice bringing up any benefits and added value. - I recommend adding to the Conclusion section a brief research limitation issue in more detail within this explored issue along with the further research intentions related to the topic in the future. - It is not appropriate to use citations and new ideas in Conclusions! 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and relevant using the proper sources of information.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Paper is clear and understandable, and the overall level of language being used is very good.	
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:	Marcel Kordoš
Department, University & Country	Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín, Slovak Republic