

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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The objective of the study is not clear on the abstract.</p> <p>I’m not sure if the journal adopts APA Style, but I suggest the authors review citations. For example:</p> <p>(Fairfield and Fairfield, 2014) – I suggest using the &, as APA establishes (Schatsky and Muraskin, 2015; Kim <i>et al.</i>, 2018). – Kim et al. should go first, by alphabetical order. Enyi, & Le, 2017; - citation is not adequately formatted.</p> <p>In the second page, what appears to be the objective of the study is determined:</p> <p>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. Specifically, the study seeks answers to the interactions between CSSPS user satisfaction, user demographics, the prospects, and the challenges of the CSSPS diffusion in Ghana.</p> <p>I believe that the sentence after the “Specifically” is, actually, the study’s objective. But there are two different objectives (examining prospects and challenges [...] and seeks answers to the interactions between CSSPS [...]). I believe the objective should be refined and cited after the long explanation that comes with the paragraph.</p> <p>It’s not clear who are the respondents of the survey.</p> <p>Again, references should be checked in is format.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I’m having doubts whether some subsections of Case Background are referring the object of the case study, or if it’s referring to more global aspects of CSSPS. In this case, they should be in the section before. I suggest explaining more how is CSSPS working, actually, in the case study, since this relation is not clear in the writing of this subsection.</p> <p>In Table 4, I wonder why skewness is shown, but not kurtosis. Usually, we check upon both of them to see if the sample has a normal distribution.</p>	
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:	Pedro Augusto Croce Carlotto
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil