

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_128742
Title of the Manuscript:	Responsible Data Scientist: A Paradigm Shift Beyond the "Sexiest Job"
Type of the Article	Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript highlights a critical shift in the role of data scientists, emphasizing ethical practices, privacy, governance, and accountability. It is highly relevant as it addresses growing concerns in AI and data usage in various domains like healthcare, finance, and governance. The focus on responsible AI and its alignment with legal frameworks such as GDPR and the EU AI Act makes this work a cornerstone for advancing ethical data science practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the core premise of the manuscript. However, a slightly modified version could be considered for greater precision: "From 'Sexiest Job' to 'Most Responsible Role': The Evolution of Data Scientists."	
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 effectively summarizes the main arguments of the paper. It is comprehensive, but a minor addition explaining the proposed framework for fostering responsible data science could enhance its impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust. It draws on relevant and recent studies, including references to GDPR, the EU AI Act, and ethical frameworks for AI, ensuring its alignment with current discourse in responsible data science.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent. However, including a broader representation of non-European ethical AI frameworks could enrich the manuscript, especially those from the U.S. (e.g., NIST AI Risk Management Framework) or Asia.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is well-suited for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical improvements, such as simplifying overly long sentences, could improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from a brief discussion on the challenges and barriers to implementing responsible data science in low-resource settings. Visual aids summarizing key principles (e.g., ethical frameworks, hiring strategies) could enhance clarity and engagement.	

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:	Mohit Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Bharati Vidyapeeth's College of Engineering, India