

# Review of: "Healthcare Systems Moving Toward Data Governance-Centered Model: India's G20 Presidency in the Wake of COVID"

Zhang Qian

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Dear editor

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to provide further clarification regarding the decision to reject your recently submitted academic paper, titled "Healthcare Systems Moving Toward Data Governance Centered Model: India's G20 Presidency in the Wake of COVID," which was considered for publication in the Journal/Conference.

Following a thorough review process by our editorial board and peer reviewers, your paper was **Rejected and not accepted for publication.**

I would like to address specific concerns that influenced this decision:

- **Relevance and Original Contribution:** The primary concern raised by our reviewers was the relevance of the paper to our journal/conference's scope and the perceived lack of a substantial original contribution to the field. Your paper was evaluated in the context of the criteria for the publication, and it was found that it did not align closely with the specific focus and objectives of our journal/conference.
- **Clarity and Terminology:** Reviewers pointed out issues related to clarity and terminology. Specifically, it was noted that there was a lack of differentiation between the terms "governance" and "presidency" throughout the paper, creating significant confusion. This misalignment in terminology hindered the paper's effectiveness in addressing the intended subject matter.
- **Inclusion of Data and Models:** Your paper did not provide sufficient empirical data or models to substantiate the arguments and claims presented. The absence of data analysis and modeling limited the paper's ability to support its assertions adequately.
- I do understand that academic research is a complex process, and the rejection of a paper can be disappointing. However, our journal/conference maintains rigorous standards to ensure the quality and relevance of the papers we publish.
- **Abstract Citation Concern:** Additionally, it was observed that the abstract of your paper contained information that could not be readily cited or supported within the body of the paper. Abstracts should provide a concise summary of the paper's main findings and contributions, and any claims made within the abstract should be supported within the main text.
- While your submission did not align with our current criteria, we encourage you to consider these feedback points as

opportunities for improvement in future submissions.

- In light of these concerns, i would recommend revisiting your paper to clarify the distinction between governance and presidency, as well as incorporating relevant data and models to support your arguments more effectively. Additionally, we encourage you to explore alternative publication avenues that may better align with your research focus.
- **that the decision to reject your paper is not a reflection of the quality of your work or your abilities as a researcher. Academic publishing is highly competitive, and many factors influence the selection process.**

If you have any further questions or would like detailed feedback from the reviewers, please feel free to reach out to us.

We are committed to assisting researchers in their academic endeavors.

I do appreciate your interest in our journal/conference and thank you for considering us for your submission.

I wish you success in your ongoing research efforts

Sincerely,

**Reviewer**