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| 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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript, "A Comprehensive Study on Scope and Challenges in Digital Inheritance," analyses a rapidly developing topic at the intersection of technology, law, and ethics, enhancing the academic conversation. The study clarifies the challenges of managing digital assets post-mortem while adhering to privacy and regulatory regulations. This study facilitates interdisciplinary dialogue and provides a platform for policymakers, technologists, and legal professionals to address digital inheritance challenges. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | This title denotes a comprehensive approach to identifying, evaluating, and clarifying relevant issues within a topic of increasing importance in the digital age. |  |
| 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. | Your abstract provides valuable information and encompasses the context, the problem at hand, and the scope of the study. Various elements could be improved to achieve greater completeness and organization. The abstract states that the study discusses digital heritage and its alternatives; however, it would be improved by including the main purpose. The abstract fails to outline the methodology of the study. Clarifying whether the essay was grounded in a literature review or a case study would offer additional context. The results and conclusions fail to address the primary findings of the study. Adding research highlights or insights would be valuable. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | This study makes a notable contribution to the discussion on digital heritage; however, it requires stronger evidence and formal citations to meet the standards of scientific rigour. The research has a strong conceptual foundation, and the issue is clearly outlined; however, incorporating data or case studies that demonstrate the use of digital heritage would strengthen the author's argument. Furthermore, the author fails to employ suitable citations or references to substantiate his assertions. In the absence of this, scientific rigour is constrained. The document fails to expressly delineate any research approach, including systematic review, case study analysis, or survey. The work seems to be a conceptual or descriptive analysis. The paper might benefit from the inclusion of a methodology section or empirical data to enhance its scientific credibility. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestionsfor additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The manuscript seems to be missing clear references or citations. The manuscript discusses platform policies and challenges concerning digital inheritance; however, it does not include explicit citations or references to authoritative sources, such as peer-reviewed journals and legal case studies or legislation. Further references are available in the Journal of Law and Technology, including articles related to digital heritage and legal frameworks surrounding digital assets, as well as studies that explore the intersection of technology, law, and heritage planning. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the article is suitable for general readers; however, it requires refinement to align with scholarly communication standards. Emphasising formality, conciseness, and technical precision will enhance readability and academic rigour. |  |
| Optional/Generalcomments | By addressing these concerns, the manuscript has the potential to serve as a foundation for conversations that span multiple disciplines and to propel significant developments in the field of digital inheritance.The manuscript is **suitable for acceptance** and publication as a book chapter; however, it would benefit from revisions based on the aforementioned feedback. |  |
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