- The manuscript fails the technical screening: Lack of originality, novelty, or significance.

- A clear hypothesis hasn’t been established: The question behind the research may be unclear, poorly formulated, or irrelevant to the research field.

- The manuscript is incomplete: The paper might contain observations but is not a full study, or it may ignore or overlook other important work in the field.

- Poor writing and organization: There are flaws in the procedures, presentation or analysis of the data.

- Flaws in the manuscript’s arguments and/or conclusions. -

- Language, writing and spelling issues: Large number of careless errors like poor grammar or spelling. -

- Sentences that are not clear and concise; Poorly designed tables or figures, etc. -

- Space constraints. -

- a blockchain-based anonymous, transparent, and decentralized platform," -please clearly explain briefly in the Introduction/discussion. – not understand

- All the figures/references should be cited/referred in the text and vice versa. Seems no figure has been cited in the paper. -not understand

- like programming source codes. You can consider them to be written as

step-by-step pseudocodes/algorithms.-

- described much more lucidly. It appears like taken from several common resources.

- less technical contribution.

-A visual methodology will help readers to understand it better

- You used flowcharts which the symbols are wrong for example start and end must be

ellipse. Check all symbols. -

- All figures must be cited in the text and explained in detail -

- Rewire Algorithm in an algorithmic style. Not as a code.

- There is no result. How did you evaluate the work?

- How do you validate your methodology? Only showing diagram and algorithm does not works properly. -not understand

- In this paper, the authors developed/implemented the method but did not compare with any existing system -not understand

- I understand that this is a new system and the performance cannot be directly compared with others. However, a comparison and/or a systemic evaluation of the result is needed to publish this article. -not understand

- its better to describe why the proposed work is better than the other researchers' work. -

- This paper's methodology is unclear, and the analysis section is lacking.

- Must describe all used figures -

- Brief the research problem, drawbacks of the previous study & the advantages of the proposed system in one quoted line. -

- In the introduction, the findings of the present research work should be compared with the recent work of the same field towards claiming the contribution made. -

- Enrich the article with a Literature review. Try to identify the research gap up to 2020. -

- Support your results with suitable and updated references in the discussion. -

- Mention future scope of work -

- How the proposed system is feasible for real time implementation?

**Current model or research papers’ limitation:** Write down the overall limitations/gap of the previous research papers in your field; mostly, you can write those papers that have been reviewed in your literature review part. It can be written in a paragraph at the end of the literature review section. It is written as a paragraph.

**Unique contribution:** Write your specific contribution in the introduction section at the end of the introduction before the last paragraph (how to organize paper); it is recommended to write your contribution in a paragraph. It is written as a paragraph.

**Result section:** put all your research's possible results, graphs, and numbers.

**Discussion**: explain your result using numbers, graphs, etc. it must be compared your results with other research papers and explained.