

Literature Survey, Review of Existing System(s), Limitations of Existing System(s)

Literature Survey

Author(s) / Year	Title / Platform	Key Features	Limitations
Vitalik Buterin, Ethereum (2015)	Ethereum Whitepaper	Introduced smart contracts enabling decentralized applications	General-purpose; not specific to crowdfunding
Giveth.io (2017–Present)	Giveth Decentralized Crowdfunding	Donation-based platform; smart contracts control fund distribution	Still under development; limited adoption
Kickstarter	Centralized Crowdfunding Platform	Popular, user-friendly, wide audience reach	Centralized control, high fees, lack of transparency
WeiFund (2016)	Open platform for crowdfunding on Ethereum	Campaigns run fully on smart contracts; open-source	Project discontinued; lacked user engagement and long-term support
Fundition.io (2018)	Blockchain-based social crowdfunding	Decentralized, integrates social features	Platform-specific token dependency; adoption issues

Review of Existing Systems

- **Kickstarter / GoFundMe:** Centralized platforms that host crowdfunding campaigns, control approval processes, and take a percentage of raised funds.
 - **Giveth:** A DApp focused on donations with built-in transparency and traceability using smart contracts.
 - **Fundition:** Uses blockchain to power donation-based fundraising with a social layer.
 - **WeiFund:** An early Ethereum-based DApp that explored decentralized crowdfunding.
-

Limitations of Existing Systems

1. Centralized Platforms:

- Dependence on a trusted third party.
- High service and transaction fees.
- Vulnerable to censorship and platform bias.
- Lack of financial transparency post-campaign.

2. Early DApps:

- Low adoption and poor UX compared to centralized platforms.
 - Limited scalability.
 - Dependency on specific tokens or chains.
 - Often lack milestone-based fund release mechanisms.
-