Comment Group 3's Draft from Group 1

1. Scientific/practical merit: correctness, accuracy, significance, and non-triviality:

    *   Related works section was not clear. It was very difficult to determine whether solutions provided were from papers that the authors read or from the authors themselves.

    *   Also related work described general information about e-Voting, did not specify how other researchers solved the problems cited, algorithms they proposed and the feasibility of it. The details provided were high-level.

    *   Proposed algorithm seemed generic but was difficult to tell due to the formatting.

    *   Paper however did not describe the process of coercion for readers to get some idea about how it is done in e-Voting.

2. Presentation: clarity, organization, and English usage:

    *   Algorithm presented was not in the proper format so it was very difficult to confirm the accuracy of their algorithm.

    *   There were some minor typographical errors and spelling mistakes that needed to be addressed.

    *   The paper flowed quite well from background, problems, related works and conclusion.