

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_98101
Title of the Manuscript:	Behavioural and organisational factors determination in Blockchain analysis
Type of the 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, I think this study is very useful and important for the scientific community. The integration of new technology and human behavior is very important and decisive in the near future.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable. But It would be better if there is a reference to the selected community that includes food and fashion.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think it is true.</p> <p>Yes, they are sufficient.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In my opinion, the method and tools were well explained and the process of answering the research questions was also complete. Therefore, I only thank and appreciate the efforts of the researcher.	

### 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:	Farzad Mirshamsi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran