Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_85248**
Title of the Manuscript:	**HashNET Blockchain Consensus for DLT Applications**
Type of the 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy)

<mark>PART 1:</mark> 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	1. Overall, the basic background is not introduced well, where the notations are not illustrated much clear. 2.What is the motivation of the proposed work? Research gaps, objectives of the proposed work should be clearly justified. 3.An Abstract, there is no brief discussion of research motivation, potential issues, and how the proposed work resolve the issue. 4. The literature has to be strongly updated with some relevant and recent papers focused on the fields dealt with in the manuscript. 5. Quality of figures is so important too. Please provide some high-resolution figures. Some figures have a poor resolution 6. The research results reported are too premature for publication. More work is needed to substantiate the conclusions in your manuscript 7.Authors are suggested to include more discussion on the results and also include some explanation regarding the justification to support why the proposed method is better in comparison towards other methods. 8.Conclusion Section - Authors are suggested to highlight their exact best results in comparison of other methods to justify the advantages of their proposed method. 9. The language usage throughout this paper need to be improved, the author should do some proofreading on it	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General 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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**R. Manikandan**
Department, University & Country	**School of Computing, SASTRA Deemed To Be University, India**