

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The background and literature review have a good writing style; however, it is not clear what the focus of the student is exactly. The literature review does not contain sufficient material to properly and comprehensively describe the work – too few papers are cited. The student could definitely include some more papers and conduct some form of self-reasoned comparative analysis on these and summarise the results possibly in tabular form. Furthermore, there is sparse description and comparison with respect to smart contracts. A better scientific explanation and comparison would be required. More issues and advantages of smart contracts in the context of Blockchain technology should be presented.

The following points need to be brought to the attention of the student:

- The student immediately delves into the proposed solution - the scope of the stage 1 report is to provide a rigorous review of related work (and supporting background material) motivating the proposed solution (artefact);
- Most of the text and claims are not backed by citations. Starting from 2.1.1, the student gives an explanation of what Blockchain is, without referring to any source. This is especially problematic in section 2.3 (literature review), with statements such as “Integration of IoT devices with smart contracts was discovered to have some limitations and challenges. For instance, a particular approach for IoT devices is advantageous because the code is likely small and compact.”, not being backed up by any scholarly source;
- In the literature review, the student should avoid referring to their own proposed solutions, such as “The proposed solution uses blockchain technology, which enables the verification of digital processes occurring on IoT devices”;
- It is recommended that the student reproduces tables from scratch, rather than importing them as images (e.g., Figure 2.2 - which should also be changed to Table 2.2);
- It is understandable that the domain is quite limited, given the nature of the work, however a quick search on Scholar using the main keywords yielded some interesting results which were not covered in the literature review. Furthermore, the literature review itself could benefit from some more structure (e.g., sub-headings) if possible - to organise related work under specific approaches for instance;
- The reference list needs some attention - there is missing data in some references, along with typos.

The student is also urged to proof read his work.

[REDACTED]

---