

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_101778
Title of the Manuscript:	EXAMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTING BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY IN THE SRI LANKAN BANKING SYSTEM
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript should be improved as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Rewrite manuscript structure such as introduction, literature review, methodology, empirical results, discussions, conclusions and references. + The abstract should have the following sequence of presentation of the material - relevance, purpose, method, result, and conclusion. This is exactly the sequence it should be. Most of the volume of the abstract should be devoted to the result. + Work out the keywords. Specify the JEL codes. + The Introduction should be devoted to the relevance of the research topic, to the general formulation of the SCIENTIFIC problem. Authors should not provide a literature review here, they should not write how the research will be conducted, how the article is structured, what is the purpose of the research and what tasks will be solved by the authors. + There should be 40-50 analyzed sources in the literature review. It should start with a few introductory sentences. The review should also be concluded with 2-3 summarizing sentences. + Then the purpose of the research should be formulated. After that, state hypotheses (right here, all together and do not insert text between them). Then Methods. Next, the main section of the article is the RESULT. + Method section. Here author(s) should describe the algorithm (procedure) of the study and provide primary data for calculations or indicate the sources of their receipt. This should be done following the logic of the academic presentation of the material. If the method is qualitative, it is necessary to design a survey table and interview questions, and collect data for data analysis. + In the Discussion section, there should be a discussion of the study's results, a comparison with previous ones, a discussion of why the authors have such results and a determination of future prospects. + The Conclusions should have the following logic - indicate the purpose of the study, briefly demonstrate the obtained result, and indicate what conclusions should be drawn from it.. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Doan Van Dinh
Department, University & Country	Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam