

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115611
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Blockchain in enhancing Supply chain Transparency and Efficiency
Type of the Article	

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 is important to the scientific community because it is scientifically robust, and technically sound. It moreover, it suggests a novel block chain based supply chain tracking system which is an addition to the scientific body of knowledge.</p> <p>The title could be improved by including the key word/s "Traceability" and "Technology" to read "Role of Blockchain Technology in enhancing Supplychain Traceability, Transparency and Efficiency" or perhaps; "Embracing Blockchain Technology to address Agricultural Product Retail Supplychain Challenges".</p> <p>The abstract of the article is quite comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate, however, an addition of a section on "Gaps in Literature" as stand alone subsection could perhaps provide more insight and enhance focus on areas that may need further research.</p> <p>To me the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>I think referencing needs a lot of attention. The reference list does not reflect the robustness of the paper. Just eight references listed, appears to be very few for such a comprehensive paper. Some references made in the manuscript are not shown in the reference list. Perhaps the author needs to adopt and adhere to a specific referencing style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language used is good and quite suitable. However, there are minor grammatical errors and technical aspects like pagination omissions that can easily be corrected even by the authors themselves, I guess.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This was poised to be a novel and excellent piece of work and paper if the referencing issues raised could be ironed out.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Makota Cassian
Department, University & Country	Madziwa Teachers College, Zimbabwe