Review of: "Blockchain EV Payment Systems: A Systematic Literature Review in Retail Energy Trading"

Chen Yuling[1]

1 Guizhou University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this paper, the authors provide a systematic literature review of blockchain technology for the electric vehicle industry using a retail business-process lens. Based on a final sample of twenty-one publications, primary and sub-themes representing the body of work are identified, implications and applications are discussed. Literature-informed future research directions are proposed. However, after having gone through the manuscript, I have the following comments and suggestions that need to be addressed by the authors.

1. The format of the article is not accurate. For example, the paragraphs of the article do not use indentation and alignment, and the format of the table does not use the standard three-line table. Suggest the author adjust.

2. The citation of the paper is not standardized. For example, every sentence in the "Discussion" section quotes an article, suggesting that the author consider the logical relationship and time sequence of the content.

3. The author should pay attention to the logical relationship between sentences. For example, "The Emergence of BT has gained adoption in different industries and the technology should create business value (Yang et al., 2021)" lacks a logical relationship with the context, so the author should carefully check the full text to modify this kind of problem.

4. The summary description of the part is inconsistent with that of the text. As mentioned in the abstract, "This study a systematic literature review of blockchain technology for the electric vehicle industry using a retail business-process lens.", the text does not describe how to" use a retail business-process lens ". In the abstract, "The findings suggest that digitalizing electric vehicle networks with blockchain technology may benefit from operationalization and scalability" is mentioned, but the operability and scalability are not explained in the text.

5. The research content is inconsistent with the theme of the article. "Limitations & implications", limitations should be related to this research direction, rather than describing the limitations of literature search. The abstract mentions "primary and sub-themes representing the body of work are identified", but the text does not explain how the main and secondary themes are determined.

6 The"Methodology" section, "To limit bias and errors, the research team trained the machine independently, removed articles that all researchers deemed irrelevant, and kept the ones that all researchers deemed relevant and aligned on the"Maybe" articles. In total, 729 articles were further excluded from this process. Lastly, the researchers conducted a full-paper review and manually removed 23 articles based on the inclusion/exclusion criteria. The final sample included 21 papers." Is it necessary to provide a rationale or guideline for deletion here? Also, the statement "The proliferation of The E V technology and rapid adoption (Khan et al., 2021) by consumers requires infrastructure for longer distances" is poorly described in language and the authors are advised to adjust it.

7. The contents in Table 1 are listed in confusion. It is suggested that the author summarize the contents and then subdivide them according to the timeline.

8. Have the references been listed according to the standards? If not, the author is advised to make adjustments.

9. Tables and table headers are recommended not to be paginated, and authors are advised to adjust them.