

**Review Form 1.8**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_120179</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimization of Financial Services Transaction Management Based on Blockchain Empowerment and Hierarchical Clustering</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.8**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?  <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i></p>	<p>This is an interesting study and the authors have collected a unique dataset using cutting edge methodology. The paper is generally well written and structured.                      The author has sufficiently improved their manuscript. I enjoyed reading it, and I have no further suggestions for technical analysis.</p> <p>The author made a systematic contribution to the research literature in this area of investigation. The longitudinal nature of the work. Overall, this is a high-quality manuscript that has implications for the theoretical basis, (p.1, L28, 29.30.31).</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b>                      (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is an effective title of the article. It is easy to understand, and conveys the important aspects of the research.                      The article title represents the manuscript content in a fewest possible word,</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p>	<p>The abstracts of manuscripts submitted is a good scientific abstract, it's <b>objective</b> and accurately present the results and their meaning or significance. The abstract provides the overall information about the research.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>This is an interesting study and the authors have collected a unique dataset using cutting edge methodology. The manuscript is generally well written and structured.</p>	
<p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i></p>	<p>Overall the information presented represents valuable information. But the manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.  <b>(P.2, L28,29,30) (P3, P6)</b></p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p>	<p>In my opinion, a good reference list. Congrats for reading all that. It looks a bit like overkill, however, since few real data from the studies reported are specifically referred to in the text.                      The author made a systematic contribution to the research literature in this area of investigation. The longitudinal nature of the work. Overall, this is a high-quality manuscript that has implications for the theoretical basis, this paper contain references to earlier studies. References included in a research paper.</p>	

**Review Form 1.8**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English grammar in this manuscript has to be improved for publication and also the Literature review needs more revised. Please carefully proof-read spell check to eliminate grammatical errors". The revised manuscript from the copy-editor came with some minor changes.</p> <p>The conclusions seem to be descriptive. They should be rewritten in more details, clearly stating the facts.</p> <p>I suggest adding some graphics that show the importance of the change in economic figures.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author has sufficiently improved their manuscript. I enjoyed reading it, and I have no further suggestions for technical analysis.</p> <p>Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. The methods are generally appropriate, the results are clear.</p> <p>The author made a systematic contribution to the research literature in this area of investigation. The longitudinal nature of the work. Overall, this is a high-quality manuscript that has implications for the theoretical basis, I recommend that this paper be accepted after minor revision.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Hussein M. Traboulsi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Lebanese University, Lebanon</b></p>