



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Self-Sovereign Identity Architecture for National Use with Wallet Proofs Zero-Knowledge and the VWR Framework”

Submitted: 05 November 2025

Accepted: 20 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Md Abul Mansur

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n1p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elda Xhumari
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Nino Kharitonashvili
Caucasian University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear, precise, and accurately reflects the core contribution of the paper. It successfully captures both the technical (Self-Sovereign Identity, Zero-Knowledge Proofs) and governance aspects (Verify-Without-Reveal, national-scale deployment), and it aligns well with the scope and depth of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured. It clearly states the problem, outlines the proposed SSI–VWR architecture, describes the methodological approach, and summarizes the main contributions and results. It effectively communicates both the conceptual and operational value of the study.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The language quality is generally high and appropriate for an international journal. However, a small number of minor grammatical inconsistencies and stylistic repetitions are present. These can be easily corrected through light proofreading and do not affect the clarity or scientific value of the paper.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is clearly articulated and well justified. The combination of conceptual synthesis with comparative case analysis is appropriate for the research questions. The evaluation criteria (security, privacy, interoperability, governance, and scalability) are clearly defined and consistently applied throughout the study.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is logically structured, technically sound, and coherent. Arguments are well developed, supported by relevant literature, and clearly linked to the proposed framework. Figures and architectural explanations are helpful and enhance comprehension.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are well aligned with the analysis and findings presented in the paper. They appropriately summarize the contributions and reinforce the relevance of the SSI–VWR framework for national and EU-level digital identity systems.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is comprehensive, up-to-date, and relevant to the topic. In-text citations correspond well with the reference list. Minor formatting consistency checks could be performed, but overall the references strongly support the academic and technical arguments.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This paper presents a timely and well-structured contribution to the field of digital identity, particularly in the context of national-scale governance, privacy, and EU regulatory alignment. The integration of Self-Sovereign Identity with the Verify-Without-Reveal framework is both conceptually strong and operationally relevant.

To further strengthen the manuscript, the author may consider:

Minor language polishing to improve fluency and remove small stylistic repetitions.
Adding a brief limitations section to explicitly discuss potential implementation challenges (e.g., institutional readiness, user adoption, or cross-border governance complexities).
Optionally including a concise table summarizing key differences between traditional identity systems and the proposed SSI-VWR framework for quick reference.
Overall, the paper is of high quality and suitable for publication after minor revisions.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

yes, a bit long but clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The bstract clearly presents objects and results, and shortly metods. It would be better to add one sentece about the metods of research (though the is mentioned that te stady synthesises stadarts).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

no.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

tey are explained clearly in to body of te text.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

yes.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

yes, it is clear.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes. the used literatura is mainly 2020, there are 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 works too.

Tthey are comprehensive and appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the language is a bit thechnical, but it is due to item.
