

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRCOS_117713
Title of the Manuscript:	Revisiting Blockchain Technologies and Smart Contracts Security: A Pragmatic Exploration of Vulnerabilities, Threats, and Challenges
Type of the Article	Research Manuscript

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>The study "Revisiting Blockchain Technologies and Smart Contracts Security" is a well-researched and comprehensive examination of blockchain security vulnerabilities and mitigation strategies. Its strengths lie in its detailed technical analysis and diverse range of proposed solutions.</p> <p>Yes, the article title is suitable</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>As per my concern, this manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The specified references in the manuscript are recent and sufficient.</p> <p>Suggested to include the mentioned changes in General Comments, if possible</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>However, there are few issues with the paper, as outlined below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper's technical depth, while a merit, can also be a demerit if it makes the content less accessible to readers without a strong background in blockchain technology. Simplifying some explanations or providing additional context for complex concepts could improve readability. 2. While the study proposes numerous mitigation strategies, it lacks empirical validation or real-world testing of these solutions. By including case studies or pilot implementations of the proposed solutions would strengthen the paper's practical relevance. 3. The study does not sufficiently address the practical challenges of implementing the proposed solutions, such as the costs, required technical expertise, and potential resistance from stakeholders. Discussing these implementation barriers would provide a more balanced view. 4. Although the paper discusses interoperability challenges, it could benefit from a deeper exploration of specific integration issues with legacy systems and third-party applications. More detailed strategies for achieving seamless interoperability would enhance the study's practical utility. 5. The study could improve by incorporating quantitative analysis or metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of different security measures. This would provide a more objective basis for comparing and prioritizing the proposed solutions. 	

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:	Shaik Riyazuddin
Department, University & Country	Vasireddy Venkatadri Institute of Technology, India