

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_125505
Title of the Manuscript:	Augmenting Data Privacy Protocols and Enacting Regulatory Frameworks for Cryptocurrencies via Advanced Blockchain Methodologies and Artificial Intelligence
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	This manuscript addresses critical issues at the intersection of data privacy, blockchain technologies, and regulatory compliance for cryptocurrencies. It offers valuable insights into the integration of advanced blockchain methodologies with AI to enhance privacy and compliance. By exploring emerging technologies like Zero-Knowledge Proofs and Homomorphic Encryption, it contributes meaningfully to the discourse on sustainable cryptocurrency regulation. I find this work valuable as it combines technical robustness with practical implications for future regulatory frameworks.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it effectively captures the manuscript's focus on privacy protocols, blockchain advancements, and AI within the cryptocurrency domain.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive, detailing the study's key findings and methodologies. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of specific AI metrics (e.g., precision and recall scores) to provide a clearer overview of the AI performance discussed in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with logically organized sections that cover introduction, methodology, results, and discussion. It provides a clear and coherent flow, making it easy for readers to follow the progression of ideas.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with sound methodology and appropriate use of statistical analysis. The comprehensive examination of encryption techniques and AI applications showcases a thorough understanding of the challenges and potential solutions within cryptocurrency privacy and compliance. The empirical approach, combined with literature-backed discussions, enhances the manuscript's credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and relatively recent. However, I suggest adding a few more contemporary sources on AI in cryptocurrency to bolster the section on machine learning techniques and their effectiveness.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niravkumar Dhameliya
Department, University & Country	United States of America