

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>	<p>1. This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of the mental maps of various stakeholders involved in the adoption of blockchain technology. The study highlights the differences in priorities and perspectives among consumers, IT managers, and other professionals, which can inform strategic decisions for companies considering blockchain adoption.</p> <p>2. The title "The Genesis of the Mental Map: A Study on the Adoption of Blockchain Technology" is somewhat generic and does not fully capture the scope of the study. A more specific title could be "Stakeholder Perspectives on Blockchain Adoption: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Mental Maps."</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives and methodology but could be more detailed in describing the key findings. It would be helpful to include a brief summary of the main results, such as the differences in priorities among stakeholders and the implications for blockchain adoption.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-organized and follows a logical structure. The use of subsections helps to break down the content into manageable sections. However, some sections, such as "The Battle of the Egos," could be further clarified to better connect with the broader themes of the study.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, with a clear methodology and analysis. The use of theoretical frameworks, such as coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism, adds depth to the study. However, some sections could benefit from more detailed explanations of the theoretical underpinnings.</p> <p>6. The references are generally sufficient and recent, with a mix of academic and industry sources. However, some of the references are quite old, and it would be beneficial to include more recent studies to strengthen the manuscript's scientific foundation. For example, additional references on blockchain adoption and mental maps could be included to further support the study's findings.</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 language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications. The text is well-structured, and the author uses technical terms and concepts correctly. However, there are some minor issues with sentence structure and word choice that could be improved for better clarity and readability. For example, some sentences are overly long or contain ambiguous phrases that may require clarification. Additionally, some terms, such as "Mental Map Similarity coefficient," could be defined more explicitly for non-experts. Overall, the language is professional and suitable for a scholarly audience, but some minor editing could enhance the text's clarity and accessibility.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of the mental maps of various stakeholders involved in the adoption of blockchain technology. The study highlights the differences in priorities and perspectives among consumers, IT managers, and other professionals, which can inform strategic decisions for companies considering blockchain adoption.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured and follows a logical flow. The use of theoretical frameworks, such as coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism, adds depth to the study. The inclusion of tables and figures helps to illustrate the key findings and make the study more accessible. However, some sections could benefit from more detailed explanations of the theoretical underpinnings and the methodology used. Additionally, some sentences are overly long or contain ambiguous phrases that may require clarification.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-written and provides valuable insights into the mental maps of stakeholders involved in blockchain adoption.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Saqib Munir
Department, University & Country	NIPCONS, Pakistan