

# Your review report

## Manuscript

**WideResNet and FWBO–Based Secure Patient Monitoring: An Integrated Approach with Fog Computing, Blockchain Technology, and Federated Learning**

## Feedback for the author(s)

### Review file(s)

No files added.

### Comments to the author(s)

This is a well-written manuscript that only needs to undergo a few minor changes. Only minor revisions are needed before it can be published. The authors develop a unique theoretical framework, and I believe that they should highlight their originality much more.

The authors conduct very relevant research, but fail to emphasise the relevance in their introduction. The authors draw on extensive empirical evidence. I believe that they can put forward their arguments much more confidently. The authors adequately addressed my feedback from the first round of peer review. I only have some minor comments for final improvements. To improve the readability of the paper, I suggest dividing the analysis into several subsections. The manuscript contains an elaborate literature review, but definitions of the key concepts are needed in the introduction. Throughout the manuscript, there are several language mistakes.

## Confidential feedback for the Editor

Your recommendation

• *Accept*

Is the experimental procedure or study design appropriate to answer the research question (including the use of appropriate controls)? Are the conclusions supported by the evidence presented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>
Please rate the novelty of the research on a scale of 1–5 (1=not at all novel and 5=extremely novel)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>3</i></li></ul>
Is the presentation of the work clear, with regards to language and grammar?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Acceptable</i></li></ul>
Does the title and abstract of this paper clearly reflect its content? And are the keywords representative of the research?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>
Does the introduction present the purpose of the research investigation and is the purpose supported by the pertinent literature?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>
Are the methods described sufficiently to allow the research study to be repeated by other parties? Is the software data code provided sufficient to be replicated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>
If applicable to the paper? Is the use of statistics and treatment of uncertainties appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes, it is</i></li></ul>
Are the images in this manuscript free from improper manipulation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>
Are the tables and figures well designed and necessary?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>
Are the references provided appropriate and up to date?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Yes</i></li></ul>

**Confidential comments to the Editor**

This is a well-written manuscript that only needs to undergo a few minor changes. Only minor revisions are needed before it can be published. The authors develop a unique theoretical framework, and I believe that they should highlight their originality much more. The authors conduct very relevant research, but fail to emphasise the relevance in their introduction. The authors draw on extensive empirical evidence. I believe that they can put forward their arguments much more confidently. The authors adequately addressed my feedback from the first round of peer

review. I only have some minor comments for final improvements. To improve the readability of the paper, I suggest dividing the analysis into several subsections. The manuscript contains an elaborate literature review, but definitions of the key concepts are needed in the introduction. Throughout the manuscript, there are several language mistakes.