

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JET_12595
Title of the Manuscript:	Artificial Intelligence critical or comfortable for Corporate Governance
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 is a significant contribution to the scientific community as it explores the interplay between artificial intelligence (AI) and corporate governance (CG), particularly in the manufacturing sector. By addressing both the critical challenges and transformative potential of AI in enhancing CG practices, the study offers valuable insights for academia and industry practitioners. Its findings on ethical considerations, risk management, and data governance frameworks provide a robust foundation for future research and practical implementation. The focus on China's rapidly evolving AI landscape further adds to its relevance, showcasing strategies that could be adapted globally to integrate AI into governance effectively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Artificial Intelligence: Critical or Comfortable for Corporate Governance," provides a thematic overview but may lack precision and appeal to the target scientific audience. A more refined and descriptive alternative could be: "Balancing Challenges and Opportunities: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Enhancing Corporate Governance Practices." This alternative emphasizes the dual focus on challenges and benefits while aligning with the manuscript's detailed exploration of AI's integration into corporate governance.	

<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>The abstract effectively outlines the study's focus on the critical and comfortable aspects of AI for corporate governance, emphasizing its role in risk management and decision-making. However, it could benefit from mentioning the methodological approach (thematic analysis of expert interviews) more prominently to provide context. Additionally, summarizing the key findings on mitigation strategies and ethical considerations would make the abstract more comprehensive. Deleting repetitive mentions of AI's challenges could enhance clarity and conciseness.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically sound, as it builds upon established literature and employs a rigorous qualitative methodology to analyze data from expert interviews. The use of thematic analysis aligns with the research objectives, and the findings are well-supported by relevant academic references. However, ensuring all claims are backed by citations and addressing limitations like sample size and industry scope would strengthen its scientific validity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are adequate and include recent studies, providing a solid foundation for the manuscript. However, adding more contemporary sources on AI integration in governance beyond China, as well as exploring cross-industry applications, could enrich the discussion. References addressing AI's ethical frameworks and global regulatory approaches would also enhance the manuscript's depth.</p>	

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are occasional grammatical errors and instances of redundancy that could be streamlined for better readability. Refining sentence structures and ensuring consistent terminology throughout the text would further enhance its academic quality. A thorough proofreading or professional language editing is recommended.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Based on the content and analysis provided, I would assign an overall score of >8-9 to the manuscript. It is well-structured, scientifically sound, and relevant to contemporary discussions on AI and corporate governance. However, some improvements in language clarity, ethical transparency, and broader reference inclusion could enhance the manuscript's scholarly quality. Further refinement of the abstract and a more detailed exploration of the ethical and practical implications would elevate the work.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sunday Abayomi Joseph</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Ashland University, United States</p>