

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_118672
Title of the Manuscript:	Blockchain adoption in networks: the decision flow through three arenas
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper investigates how blockchain technology is being adopted by networks, providing information about how decisions are made in various contexts. The scientific community should be aware of this issue, especially those working in the commerce, management, and economics domains. The book makes a significant contribution to information that can guide research and practical applications in a variety of areas by addressing the challenges associated with blockchain adoption. 2. The main idea of the book is succinctly summarized in the title, "Blockchain adoption in networks: the decision flow through three arenas". It conveys the emphasis on blockchain technology in network contexts and the associated decision-making procedures in an understandable manner. There is no need to suggest any more titles. 3. The manuscript's goals, methodology, main conclusions, and consequences are briefly summarized in the abstract, which also offers a quick summary of the work. It may be improved, though, by providing more precise information on the three areas covered in the decision cycle. A succinct synopsis of the primary contributions could also increase comprehension and spark reader interest. 4. The organization of the manuscript seems well-planned, with distinct subsections that lead the reader through the debate. Every section makes sense in light of the one before it, adding to the argument's overall coherence. However, reading comprehension and readability may be improved by making little changes to the material flow or subsection titles. 5. The text exhibits a solid scientific methodology, supported by pertinent theoretical frameworks and literature. The analysis is presented coherently, and the approaches used seem adequate for the goals of the study. To maintain scientific rigor, additional elucidation or verification of specific theoretical conceptions or empirical data could be required. 6. A thorough summary of pertinent research on supply chain management, blockchain adoption, and related subjects may be found in the sources given. <p>References need to be improved and updated.</p> <p>To guarantee the incorporation of the most recent research insights, a few recent articles (within the previous two years) could be added. Furthermore, citing important publications on the topic could improve the manuscript's theoretical base.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The article's language and English quality are typically appropriate for academic discourse. To enhance clarity, coherence, and adherence to academic writing rules, some small modifications could be necessary. Checking the work for grammatical problems, sentence construction, and word choice could improve its readability and professionalism overall.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides insightful information about how networks make decisions regarding the use of blockchain technology. The authors have made significant contributions to theoretical knowledge as well as real-world applications by successfully identifying important elements and mechanisms influencing adoption dynamics. To enhance the manuscript's scholarly contributions, additional clarification on theoretical frameworks, empirical methodology, and management consequences is recommended.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	Anisha Arora
Department, University & Country	School of Business, Chandigarh University, India