



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_48655
Title of the Manuscript:	EdDSA over Galois Field $GF(2^m)$ for multimedia data
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>This paper is readable and the writing style is clear. It meets some objectives and gives some experimental results and findings. However there are many serious problems that need to be resolved before this paper can be accepted for publication in a journal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Overall the paper is too short. All the sections of the paper require additional material to clarify the problem and methodology that is being used</li> <li>ii) A related works section or background section that compares similar works is missing. It is important to compare and see similar works</li> <li>iii) The figures put in the paper are not explained and referenced in the paper. I.e. they are just put there but there is no reference e.g. to fig.1, fig2. Etc in the text</li> <li>iv) The results section is way too short and the results presented from MATLAB need to be properly shown in tabular form and clearly explained</li> <li>v) There are no comparisons with similar results or other findings from other papers</li> <li>vi) In other words the result section needs to be greatly improved and much more information needs to be added to this section</li> <li>vii) Section 3.1. that compares the results is too short. It requires more work and explanation</li> <li>viii) The limitations of this study need to be clearly stated and explained.</li> <li>ix) For this type of work it would be nice if the authors use some form of graph that compares the performance of the algorithms at different stages</li> <li>x) The conclusions are too short too</li> <li>xi) <b><u>This paper has just 6 references! It should at least have 15-20 references.</u></b> <b><u>The references are not included in the text. In fact in the text i.e. the references are just at the end of the paper and not used in the paper. This is not correct because the algorithms used and the techniques etc. Need to be clearly referenced.</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>e.g.</u></b> Generally, a point <math>P = (x, y)</math> lies on E, a twisted Edwards curve if it verifies the following formula: <math>ax^2 + y^2 = 1 + dx^2y^2</math> where a, d are two distinct, non-zero elements of the field M over which E is defined. It is untwisted in the special case where <math>a=1</math>, because the curve reduces to an ordinary Edwards curve. Consider 'a' and 'd' values in the above equation as 10 and 6 respectively. The equation becomes <math>\rightarrow 10x^2 + y^2 = 1 + 6x^2y^2</math>. For which the plot of Edward curves is shown below</p> <p><b><u>Is this the author's work ? If this is taken from other work it requires a reference</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Even the diagrams are they the authors or have they been taken from another source?</u></b></p> <p><b><u>e.g. the introduction part has no references . This is not a good practice!</u></b></p> <p><b><u>ALL the techniques in the paper unless created by the author need to be clearly referenced otherwise just presenting them would amount to PLAGARIZATION!</u></b></p> <p>It is suggested that the authors rewrite this paper and address the problems. They should be able to come up with good work</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anthony Spiteri Staines</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Malta, Malta</b>