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| 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.** | **This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in enhancing public service delivery in South Africa. It identifies critical enablers such as digital infrastructure, workforce development, and regulatory frameworks essential for the responsible adoption of AI in state-owned companies (SOCs). The research contributes valuable insights into overcoming unique challenges in the South African context and highlights the need for further studies on specific AI applications.**  **As a reviewer, I appreciate the manuscript's timely focus and practical recommendations, which can drive meaningful change in public services. However, incorporating case studies or real-world examples of successful AI implementation would enhance its impact and provide clearer guidance for practitioners.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is quite suitable.** |  |
| 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 of the manuscript provides a solid overview of the objectives, findings, and recommendations concerning the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in South Africa's state-owned companies (SOCs). However, it could be improved by incorporating a few key elements. First, the primary objectives of the study should be clearly stated at the beginning to outline the focus, whether it is on evaluating existing frameworks, identifying challenges, or proposing solutions. Additionally, a brief mention of the methodological approach, such as doctrinal analysis or qualitative interviews, would offer context for the findings presented. While the abstract does address key findings, it could summarize the most critical challenges and opportunities identified in the study to enhance clarity. Lastly, including a mention of the need for future research would emphasize the study's implications for ongoing inquiry in this field. By integrating these suggestions, the abstract can provide a more comprehensive overview of the manuscript's contributions.** |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized, making it easy to follow the discussion on AI in South African state-owned companies (SOCs). The clear division into sections, such as legal frameworks and key considerations, aids in understanding complex issues. However, incorporating more explicit transitions between sections could enhance clarity and guide readers through the analysis. Overall, the structure effectively supports the manuscript's objectives.** |  |
| **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 manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and technical soundness through its thorough analysis of legal frameworks and their implications for AI deployment in South African state-owned companies (SOCs). It integrates relevant legislation and regulatory guidelines, providing a solid foundation for its arguments. The use of a doctrinal approach, complemented by qualitative data from SOC managers, strengthens the study's empirical basis, highlighting real-world challenges and opportunities in AI adoption. Furthermore, the manuscript effectively addresses both legal and ethical considerations, ensuring a comprehensive view of the multifaceted issues surrounding AI in the public sector. This robust approach enhances the credibility of the findings and recommendations presented.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and relevant sources that support the analysis of AI deployment in South African state-owned companies (SOCs). However, to enhance the manuscript's robustness, it would benefit from including additional references that address recent developments in AI technology and its regulatory environment. For instance, incorporating studies from 2023 or later could provide updated insights into the evolving landscape of AI in public service delivery. Additionally, references to global best practices in AI governance and ethical frameworks would further enrich the discussion. Some specific suggestions for additional references might include recent publications from reputable journals focusing on AI ethics, technology policy, or public administration.** |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and appropriately formal for an academic audience. However, there are instances where the phrasing could be improved for clarity or flow. Minor grammatical errors and awkward sentence structures should be addressed to enhance readability. Overall, while the manuscript is comprehensible and coherent, careful editing could further polish the language and improve the overall quality of the writing. |  |
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