

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125505
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Augmenting Data Privacy Protocols and Enacting Regulatory Frameworks for Cryptocurrencies via Advanced Blockchain Methodologies and Artificial Intelligence</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I really like this manuscript because it tackles the crucial topic of balancing privacy and regulatory compliance in the cryptocurrency space, which is becoming more relevant with the rise of digital assets. The exploration of advanced technologies like Zero-Knowledge Proofs and Homomorphic Encryption is insightful, showing the potential for innovation while addressing privacy concerns. I also appreciate how the manuscript highlights the role of AI in enhancing compliance, even though it points out the challenges with false positives, which is a realistic and honest assessment of the current limitations.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is quite suitable as it clearly conveys the core focus of the research—enhancing data privacy and regulatory frameworks in the context of cryptocurrencies.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key findings and focus areas, including the evaluation of current data privacy protocols, the role of AI, and advanced blockchain technologies. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and results. However, it could benefit from a slightly more detailed mention of the statistical results (such as AI's precision issues) to give readers a clearer sense of the findings upfront. Including a brief note on the study's recommendations for hybrid encryption methods and AI refinement would further enhance its impact and provide a well-rounded summary. Overall, the abstract is strong but could be fine-tuned with these additions for even greater clarity and completeness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are well-organized and appropriate.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it employs a solid methodological framework, utilizing descriptive statistics, comparative analysis, and logistic regression to assess data privacy protocols in cryptocurrency platforms. The use of real-world data from reputable sources like CoinMarketCap and Kaggle further strengthens the validity of the findings. Additionally, the manuscript incorporates advanced technologies such as Zero-Knowledge Proofs and Homomorphic Encryption, which are well-recognized in the field, ensuring the research is grounded in cutting-edge developments. Overall, the analysis is thorough and based on reliable scientific methods, making it a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are sufficient and recent, reflecting the latest advancements in blockchain technology, artificial intelligence, and cryptocurrency regulations.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are highly suitable for scholarly communication.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NA	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bhavik Patel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>United States</b>