

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_102913
Title of the Manuscript:	Blockchain for Combating Pharmaceutical Drug Counterfeiting and Cold Chain Distribution
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. It is quite contributory to the existing body of knowledge and will be helpful in minimizing challenges with supply chain. This area been left out with the assumption that systems are effective and efficient.</p> <p>Yes. However, there is no target population and study area. These need to be including so that it indicates the study location</p> <p>The abstract needs to be reworked on as indicated in the comments section as guided. Some basic items are missing There is some chronological flow only that section are not taking the format of a research report on something in the manuscript</p> <p>Yes. The manuscript is scientifically fit, but with a comprehensive address of the given comments</p> <p>Yes. They are sufficient</p> <p>The author needs to address the comments with a lot of humility in order to make the article resembles the level of study</p>	
<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>	<p>The author needs to avoid lots of repetition in the literature, make it article progressive developing on prior concepts</p> <p>(There is a need to clarity here whether it a simple examination of literature or some desk review, project or developed project. Work on given 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:	Francis Matheka Muoki
Department, University & Country	Kenya Medical Training College, Kenya