



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_54018</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Blockchains and Internet of Things for the pooling of warehouse resources</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Paper</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In general, a very good and attractive subject. Actually appropriately developed paper.</p> <p>The authors were very clear in their research plan.</p> <p>The abstract is clear and provides clear introduction to the parts of the paper, except it is missing the methodology and implications</p> <p>The introduction is appropriate, with appropriate citations used [the numbers on page 2, miniscule 2 and 3, are these references,??? If yes use the adequate style as others.... The literature review is very good and streamlined. The references are updated and relevant to the topic of the research The literature is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself to the methodology and later on to the discussions.</p> <p>The methodology is not addressed. A brief paragraph must be added</p> <p>The results/arguments and built up of the model are clear, well presented appropriate to support the discussion about the objectives of the paper.</p> <p>The discussion is very good and appropriate because it does support the objectives declared through the paper</p> <p>Conclusion and recommendations are adequate</p> <p>Minor Proofreading is needed</p> <p>Referencing are adequate</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Copy of marked up manuscript is attached	

**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>Hussin Jose Hejase</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al Maaref University, Lebanon</b>