

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_129818
Title of the Manuscript:	Data Governance for Emerging Technologies: A Conceptual Framework for Managing Blockchain, IoT, and AI
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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes significantly to data governance by proposing a framework suited for emerging technologies like Blockchain, IoT, and AI. As these technologies evolve, effective data management is essential for ensuring security, privacy, and compliance. By emphasizing transparency, accountability, and adaptability, it addresses the challenges posed by decentralized and AI-driven systems. The work not only fills research gaps but also provides valuable insights for policymakers, technologists, and industry leaders aiming to develop robust data management strategies in rapidly changing digital environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Data Governance for Emerging Technologies: A Conceptual Framework for Managing Blockchain, IoT, and AI," is clear, specific, and accurately reflects the manuscript's focus. It highlights both the main topic (data governance) and the technologies discussed (Blockchain, IoT, and AI), making it highly relevant to the target audience.	

[Review Form 3](#)

<p>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.</p>	<p>Evaluation of the Abstract The abstract effectively summarizes the manuscript's core objective—proposing a conceptual framework for data governance in Blockchain, IoT, and AI. It identifies the specific challenges these technologies present, such as privacy, security, and data management complexities, and emphasizes essential governance principles like transparency, accountability, and compliance. It also stresses the need for stakeholder collaboration and adaptability in response to technological advancements.</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Objective: The manuscript's central aim is clearly articulated, making it immediately apparent to the reader. Key Themes: It touches on crucial topics such as data integrity, privacy, and ethics, providing an insightful overview of the issues addressed in the paper. Relevance: The abstract highlights the increasing significance of data governance as technology progresses, establishing the study as both timely and relevant. <p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate Specifics: A brief mention of the framework's core elements (e.g., data integrity, security, and ethical concerns) would add depth to the summary. Impact Statement: Including a statement on the potential impact or practical benefits of implementing the framework (e.g., enhancing data management efficiency) could enrich the abstract. Eliminate Redundancies: Streamlining phrases like "increasingly important" and "rapid evolution" would help improve clarity and conciseness. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Scientific Accuracy of the Manuscript The manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting a well-established conceptual framework for data governance in emerging technologies such as Blockchain, IoT, and AI. The authors demonstrate a clear understanding of the unique challenges posed by these technologies and offer a comprehensive approach to addressing issues like data integrity, privacy, security, and regulatory compliance.</p> <p>Key Points Supporting Scientific Accuracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive Coverage: The manuscript effectively covers essential data governance principles (transparency, accountability, compliance) and applies them to specific technologies. - Technological Insights: The descriptions of Blockchain's immutability, IoT's interoperability issues, and AI's ethical challenges are accurate and align with current research and industry perspectives. - Use of Evidence: The manuscript draws on recent studies and industry standards, enhancing its credibility and providing a thorough review of existing literature. <p>Minor Areas for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical Validation: Although the conceptual framework is well-explained, including empirical data or case studies could strengthen its practical relevance. • Critical Analysis: A deeper critical evaluation of existing data governance models would add more depth to the discussion. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the references sufficient and it looks are recent</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and quality of the manuscript are generally appropriate for scholarly communication. It is clear, well-organized, and free of significant grammatical errors, aiding readability. However, some sentences could be more concise to improve flow, and a few technical terms may benefit from brief explanations for clarity, particularly for readers less familiar with AI. Overall, the language is strong, requiring only minor revisions to enhance clarity and precision.	
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:	Hirenkumar Mistry
Department, University & Country	Grand Canyon University, USA