

**Paper: “Why should Business schools teach blockchain technology? The case of Botswana Accountancy College”**

**Submitted: 17 May 2021**

**Accepted: 27 September 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Wilbert Mutoko

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p349](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p349)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kamau Onesmus  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: David Maboko Nassiuma  
MOI University, Kenya

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 25:08:2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/09/2021
<b>Manuscript Title: Why should Business schools teach blockchain technology? The case of Botswana Accountancy College</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0597/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>It is clear and matches the content, need to capitalise each word.</b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Need to add the word abstract as a heading</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Some paragraphs are short and there is a statement hanging. Need also to capitalise each word in a heading, thus need for proof reading throughout the paper.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>It is good to mention your target population then narrow down to your sample size. Guide the reader on which method of analysis was used.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The results are well explained</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments). Need to mention the contribution of the study</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Should follow the chosen referencing guidelines for in text citations	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):** A good research however, there is need for proofreading to correct typological errors e.g. combine some paragraphs in the definition of terms. In the introduction on aims and objective use past tense A statement on bitcoin: ‘some people believe Satoshi...is hanging. In the literature review also use past tense when it is appropriate e.g. paragraph 3, use revealed and authors concluded. Paragraph 5

**use 'there were respondents who also acknowledged that'. Improve the methodology part. In the findings table 1 requires explanation if not should be removed. Check for the in text referencing that is not properly stated. In the conclusion you have mention university students, was your study in a university? Better if you use business school students to match your literature.. All the best.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: A good paper, Accept for publication once the minor corrections have been done.**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr. David Maboko Nassiuma	
University/Country: Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 27- 08 - 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 07-09-2021
<b>Manuscript Title: Why should Business schools teach blockchain technology? The case of Botswana Accountancy College</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 97.05.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Title has clarity, its current</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
This is well presented. However much improvement is required in indicating the way data was collected, analyzed and presented.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Very few typographical were noted.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
Expound on the research methodology. Describe the design that was adopted, data collection procedures have not been explained. How was data analysed? Other than mentioning purposive sampling there isn't much that has been explained in this section. It is important for the reader to know the study design in order to be guided on how the data should have been collected and analysed. Purposive sampling is associated with qualitative approaches of data collection and analysis. It was expected that content and thematic analysis could have been used in the ensuing section.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
As said earlier the reader has not been guided well on how the results should have been presented and analyzed. Take note of the non-probabilistic nature of purposive sampling and the data expected from that. Similar studies to support or say otherwise have not been effectively presented. Enhance this.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Fairly done</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Do not conform to the ESJ format.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

A well written paper that is current and tackles critical aspect of the society. However, enhance your literature while discussing the results. The study design is not very clear. Bring this out in order to guide how data should be collected and analysed.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

I wish to declare that the paper meets the formal and professional requirements of the European Scientific Journal. However critical corrections should be done before it is submitted and published.