



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “A Conceptual Architecture for Cross-Chain Interoperability and Dynamic Compliance in RWA Tokenization”

Submitted: 08 March 2026

Accepted: 28 September 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Md Abul Mansur

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n25p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Albin Klosinski
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Reviewer 2: Foldi Kata
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and fully adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Yes, the abstract clearly presents the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions, though it places a heavier emphasis on the objectives and technical model than on empirical results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, there are several grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and citation formatting mistakes in the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the study methods are explained clearly, though they describe a conceptual engineering and theoretical design approach rather than an empirical or experimental methodology.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The "results" (represented here as the proposed architectural framework, cross-chain lifecycle, and qualitative evaluation) are clearly presented, but they are subject to theoretical assumptions and contain minor conceptual and structural limitations.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, the conclusion is accurate and well-supported by the content of the article. The final section (Section 8: Conclusion and Future Directions) effectively synthesizes the core findings, aligns directly with the problems diagnosed in earlier sections, and offers balanced recommendations without introducing ungrounded claims.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is NOT comprehensive and appropriate. Because from the 55 items of references, only 10 items were cited in the article. 21 cited items are not in the reference. Researchgate and Journal of ISSLP, 2025 cited items are not correct.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Eliminate Phantom/Uncited References: Remove reference entries that do not appear anywhere in the body text (e.g., Arbitrum, Charltons Quantum, DWF Labs, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP, Law Commission). Fix Missing Citations: Locate or add the missing bibliography entry for in-text citations like (Anna, 2026). Replace Commercial Blogs with Academic Literature: Replace marketing agency posts, Web3 promotional blogs, and commercial media (1inch, Antier Solutions, Blockchain App Factory, QuickNode, Togggle, Zyphe) with peer-reviewed computer science literature, W3C standard specifications, or formal financial economics journals. Apply Strict Academic Style: Reformat every reference into standard APA 7th or IEEE style, including complete article titles, journal names, volume/issue details, and direct DOIs/URLs.

Clean Up Typographical and Formatting Defects Remove Artifacts: Delete stray characters and formatting symbols embedded in headings (e.g., the +1 and +3 symbols in Section 2 under Existing Compliance Mechanisms). Standardize Section Numbering: Ensure uniform header hierarchy throughout the entire manuscript. Convert unnumbered section headers (Introduction, Literature Review, System Architecture, Discussion, etc.) into a single, cohesive numerical scheme.

Strengthen Methodology & Results (Empirical Enhancements) Acknowledge Technical Scope Limitations: Clearly state in Section 3 and Section 5 that the model is presented as a conceptual design deliverable. Add Quantitative Simulation Benchmarks (Optional but Strongly Recommended): To significantly elevate the paper's scientific rigor, consider providing preliminary empirical data—such as smart contract gas execution costs, zk-SNARK proof-generation latency, or cross-chain message execution times on a public testnet (e.g., Ethereum Sepolia to Polygon Amoy).

Improve Sentence Mechanics and Readability Reduce Verb Clutter and Stacked Prepositions: Simplify overly dense sentences in Sections 5 and 6 to improve narrative flow (e.g., edit redundant phrases like "leverages... specifically utilizing" or complex multi-clause sentences). Final Recommendation to the Author(s) The manuscript presents a compelling, highly relevant architectural solution for cross-chain RWA interoperability. It is recommended for publication

subject to Major Revisions focused on re-curating the reference list, removing text artifacts, standardizing heading structures, and clarifying the empirical scope of the research.
