

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124598
Title of the Manuscript:	Organizational Workforce Management in the Digital Age: The Role of Technocultural Interventions in Mitigating the Negative Impacts of AI-Driven Technological Change
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 (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.	The manuscript is good for the scientific community due to the rapid and robust adoptions of AI subsidiaries by many economies globally. AI and its affiliates are enhancing many sectors, hence the impact of the research topic in recent times.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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 good and could remain as it is.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. But again the contents therein are more of AI.	
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.	The creative and originality of the paper is below average since most of the ideas can be seen from the AI domain. The authors' original inputs in terms of scientifically and technically sound are minimal. On the face value without the AI detection the manuscript is technically sound. But once the AI detector shows similarities with AI contents it makes one wonder the scientific contribution to knowledge by the authors.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. But they need to be reworked on with the style of the journal's format.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is good but on the contrary the AI contents are more than 60% of the entire paper. I believe the editors of the journal will respectfully take a decision on this development.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ebenezer Kofi Enninful
Department, University & Country	Takoradi Technical University, Ghana