

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 <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 article assesses the challenges that are arising in organizations due to the intervention of AI in the workforce and provides insight on how to tackle and find suitable ways to implement AI with out damaging the human labour force. I like this article because it mainly focuses on the usability of AI rather than its functionality. It calls for the attention of policy makers and leaders of an organization to think how they can integrate AI and human potential smoothly without creating sudden disruption.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title of the article describes the overall ideas of the research starting from abstract to conclusion and recommendations. It gives enough description of the research and hence it can be taken as an appropriate title	
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 author can make detailed but still short and precise abstract without missing important sections of the article. I suggest the addition of "Discussion section" in a brief and precise manner focusing on the analysed data. I appreciate the overall writing of the article except the abstract became so high level and should mention why he/she choose the specific data analysing techniques among others.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I recommend the "objective" and "significance of study" to take independent sections so that readers of this article can point out these important sections easily.	
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.	This manuscript/article is scientifically robust because it discussed important idea in today's world which was not sufficiently discussed about and well addressed, and technically sound because it gathered necessary data and analysed it using relevant techniques to create findings and recommended a solution to the assessed problem. It gives important insight for AI policy makers and leaders to look in to their organizational structure.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The author cited more than sufficient and recent references with clear and appropriate citation methods which shows the author's dedication to this article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/ English quality of this article is appropriate. I didn't notice any grammatical or semantics errors that can confuse the readers of this manuscript or able to hinder its understandability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Generally, this Manuscript sounds great because it brings the concerns of AI governance and ways to tackle it to our attention which is a big concern of the AI era.	

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:	Frehiwot Gebrekrstos Girmay
Department, University & Country	Aksum Institute of Technology, Aksum University, Ethiopia