Paper 4:

Overall approach of the paper and its contributions

The main contribution of the paper is, that it proposes a model to solve trust issues. If two different businesses want to work or are forced to work together, but do not trust each other, they want to hide information from each other, they could apply this model to provide means to work together. The model, in theory, provides a way to hide information that is not needed to be known and a validation process of communication and state changes that can be trusted by everyone.

Remarks

I have listed my comments per chapter in the table below. I've printed **bullet points in bold** if they are "major remarks". I have also added a symbol for [+] positive and [-] negative to my comments.

The paper as it is, is well written and has a lot of references. Sadly all the value is tarnished by the fact the implementation is not complete and leaves room for doubt and questions. Furthermore different approaches were rejected, because of the computational overhead. With the missing implementation, there is no way to test, if this approach is not to computational heavy. At the moment you only encrypt messages and sign them.

1 Introduction	[-] a(n) block-chain based implementation
2 Background	[+] Everything is well explained and referenced. You really get the feeling that everything was thought through and evaluated [-] section description is missing: "This section discusses the research problem .."
2.1 Blockchain-Based Choreographies	[+] Well done introduction to existing blockchain-based choreographies
2.2 Visibility Levels	[+] I like that you made a reference in the end to the upcoming section
2.3 Privacy Enhancing Technologies	[-] "Since it was shown in that there is" -> "Since it was shown that in there is a set"
3 Approach	[-] section description is missing: "This section ..." [-] use other headline than "Approach"
3.1 Assumptions and Scenario	[+] This sections makes it very clear about what the problem is and how the environment is [-] Not consistent: Under the graphic you wrote "Fig. 1" but in the text you wrote the whole name (Figure 1).
3.2 Proposed Scheme	**[-] On page 7 I'm confused: if it gets send to a random node, how does the system ensure that every node is reached and that p is reached again?**
3.3 Validation	[-] typo: "of each ~~of~~ node"
4	**[-] The implementation part feels weak with all the parts are missing. Suggestion: Maybe explain why they are missing**
5 Discussion	[-] section description is missing: "This section ..." [-] As mentioned the discussion is difficult to judge by the fact the implementation is not complete and leaves room for doubt and questions

5.1 Limitations of the Proposed Scheme	[+] I see you've been thinking about weaknesses in detail. **[-] What's missing is how relevant this weak point is to your challenge.** **Enhancement: Reduces to significant weak points or mentions relevance.**
5.2 Alternative Approaches	**[-] Somehow this seems like a repeat of section 2.3 to me.**
6 Conclusion	**[-] In this paper it is not shown that it works. With the missing implementation, it is only a concept o a model that is presented, but not really evaluated.**
References	[+] As I already mentioned, I really like your argumentative use of sources.