

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_98101</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Behavioural and organisational factors determination in Blockchain analysis</b>
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.journalcjast.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 <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	I think so, the article is bringing a very topical subject.  <b>Ok</b>  <b>Ok</b>  <b>Ok</b>  <b>Ok</b>  <b>Ok</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English language is well written;	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1) I recommend explaining a little more about the scandals that occurred in food and fashion so that readers have a better view of what is being said. 2) I suggest an explanation on the choice of the number of participants  3) Several questions were asked to be answered by the article. I suggest that the questions be listed and answered in a way that facilitates the readers' understanding, making the connection between the questions and the results obtained. I suggest that the author(s) heed the suggestions made.	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Luiz Carlos Brasil de Brito Mello</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil</b>