

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_105442
Title of the Manuscript:	Integration of Blockchain and AI: Exploring Application in the Digital Business
Type of the Article	Survey of Literature

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper is an interesting survey of the literature on both AI and blockchain technology. It covers a lot of ground, although a bit shallow. I think that it serves readers that approach these fields for the first time. In this sense, I think that professional engineers interested in possible business possibilities may find here some interesting clues. 2. Yes. The title delimits the focus of the paper and discourages misinterpretations. 3. Yes. It is a good summary of the aims of the paper and of the ground covered in the next pages. 4. Yes. 5. While I would have gone deeper in some parts, I think that for people interested in business the depth and level of analysis are more than enough. 6. The references are abundant and up to date. <p>I don't have much to add, except that perhaps a few paragraphs could be devoted to the recent excitement for Large Language Models (mentioned implicitly here), although, since the hype seems to be waning, it is better to refer more to generative (Foundation) models.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality is fine.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>My recommendation would be to accept the paper in the present form (plus the suggested references to ChatGPT and the like).</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Fernando Tohmé
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Matemática de Bahía Blanca, Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina