

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_124452
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of the Electoral Process with Hyperledger Fabric Blockchain: Real-Time Eligibility
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 is highly relevant for the scientific community, especially in areas like e-voting, blockchain, and cybersecurity. Its use of Hyperledger Fabric blockchain to automate electoral eligibility checking addresses key challenges such as data integrity, security, and transparency in the election process. The manuscript offers a novel approach to solving election inefficiencies by leveraging smart contracts and real-time data aggregation, making it both timely and impactful. I appreciate its thorough exploration of the topic, though I feel the discussion could benefit from further empirical validation and an analysis of its scalability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title appears to fit the scope of the manuscript, though it could be more specific. A possible suggestion could be: <i>"Blockchain-based Automated Electoral Eligibility Verification using Hyperledger Fabric and Smart Contracts."</i> This emphasizes both the blockchain framework and the specific problem being addressed.	
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 but slightly cluttered. A clearer separation of the key contributions—such as the use of Restful APIs, smart contracts, and the focus on real-time eligibility—would improve readability. I suggest removing some technical jargon and focusing on the core innovations and challenges addressed by the paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is logically structured with appropriate subsections, but some sections like "Related Work" could be more concise. Also, it would help to add a distinct "Limitations and Future Work" section to improve the overall flow and clarity.	
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 sound and technically robust. The implementation of the blockchain framework and use of smart contracts for real-time data integration is well-articulated. The decision to use Hyperledger Fabric adds credibility due to its privacy and security features.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly adequate and recent, but the manuscript could benefit from more recent works on blockchain scalability issues and case studies of blockchain in electoral systems. Consider citing more case studies that focus on blockchain's application in real-world voting systems.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly clear and suitable for scholarly communication, though some parts could benefit from a smoother transition between technical sections. A language check for minor grammatical errors is also recommended.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could elaborate on potential integration with existing electoral systems in different countries, outlining implementation challenges in various regulatory environments.	

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:	Jaypalsinh A. Gohil
Department, University & Country	Marwadi University, India