

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_86569
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential Prospects and Challenges of Smart Contract Diffusion: Case Study of the Computerized School Selection Placement System (CSSPS) in Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Objectives were not clearly mentioned2. Methodology should be in consonance with the objectives chosen3. Followed by methodology findings and conclusion must be related to the objectives	The objective of the study is stated in the introduction section of the paper as; "The study examines the prospects and challenges of smart contract diffusion in the sub-region using a case study of the Computer School Selection and Placement System (CSSPS) of the Ghana Education Service."
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Hypo thesis were not categorised as Null Hypothesis and an Alternate Hypothesis2. Hypothesis were not tested as per the list and results were not indicated as per the list of hypothesis	Thank you for the observation. However, once a null or an alternate hypothesis is stated in a study. Practically the other is implied. Therefore, we prefer to limit the word count of the study by stating just one at a time.
Optional/General comments	Table no.5 and 6 does not indicates the source of data under each table	We have included the sources are recommended.

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>	