

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	

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>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the decision-making process involved in adopting blockchain technology, which is a critical topic in the field of technology management. However, the sample size should have been bigger to obtain better results.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is apt.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It is suggested to re-write the abstract in 2 to 3 paragraphs rather than multiple sub-headings.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The authors employ a unique approach, analyzing the mental maps of decision-makers to understand how they perceive the relevance of blockchain technology for their organizations.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes, the references provided are recent and sufficient for the present topic.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I have suggested few changes in the document in the comment section for review.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Prity Khastgir
Department, University & Country	India