



# International Journal of Innovative Research in Science Engineering and Technology (IJIRSET)

*(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)*



**Impact Factor: 8.699**

**Volume 15, Issue 2, February 2026**

# Design and Analysis of Autonomous Theft-Proof Delivery Robots for Industrial and Commercial Applications

Harshil Patel<sup>1</sup>, Ms. Apexa Purohit<sup>2</sup>, Mr. Mayur Chavda<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Mayank Dev Singh<sup>4</sup>

P.G. Student, Department of Mechatronics Engineering, ITM Vocational University, Vadodara, Gujarat, India<sup>1</sup>

Assistant Professor, Department of Mechatronics Engineering, ITM Vocational University, Vadodara, Gujarat, India<sup>2</sup>

Assistant Professor, Department of Mechatronics Engineering, ITM Vocational University, Vadodara, Gujarat, India<sup>3</sup>

Associate Professor, Department of Mechatronics Engineering, ITM Vocational University, Vadodara, Gujarat, India<sup>4</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** The rapid emergence of autonomous delivery robots demonstrates how these robots could assist the delivery industry throughout food service delivery services, e-commerce logistics, healthcare campuses and industrial facilities while lowering operating costs for employers, eliminating lag times for customers and increasing employee safety through reduced worker exposure to the general public. Even though substantial research has been completed on ADRs, further studies on ADR-related topics such as package theft, impropriety of access and system tampering as well as cybercrime exist; furthermore, many issues within the above-mentioned topics continue to prohibit the widespread implementation of ADRs within structured and unstructured environments.

In this paper, an in-depth literature review will focus on the field of autonomous delivery robots designed specifically to provide enhanced safety from theft. Approx. 15 articles published in technical journals and at conferences between 2006 and 2023 have been systematically reviewed, using recognized computer science databases - IEEE Xplore, SpringerLink, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. For further analytic depth, comparative evaluation tables of the various types of navigation systems (e.g. ultrasonic, LiDAR and vision-based), embedded control platforms (Arduino, Raspberry Pi and NVIDIA Jetson Nano) and methods of security (e.g. PIN, RFID, QR-code and biometric) will be shown, comparing them against their cost, accuracy, scalability, computational complexity and practicality for real-world application.

**KEYWORDS:** Autonomous Delivery Robots, Anti-Theft Security Mechanisms, Robot Navigation and Control Platforms & Cybersecurity in Mobile Robotics

## I. INTRODUCTION

The growth of eCommerce Web sites and food delivery service (e.g., DoorDash, Grubhub) combined with the development of on-demand logistics creates a unique problem: Last-Mile Delivery. Supply Chain Management is divided into various tiers, with Last-Mile Delivery representing the tier that connects consumers directly to distribution centres. Modern logistics systems have identified Last-Mile Delivery as the least efficient and most susceptible tier due to the increasing cost of labour, traffic congestion, and the unpredictability of both delivery times and safety for pedestrians who are making deliveries, as well as the increasing frequency of stolen or lost packages while still out for delivery. To address this need, technologically advanced appliances, known as Autonomous Delivery Robots, have arisen. ADRs are mobile robotic units that are GMT (walking) robots that are fully autonomous and may navigate sidewalks/pedestrian pathways (e.g., driveways) and other environments while carrying items like food, parcels, medical supplies, and retail items. The robots utilize their onboard sensors as well as control, communication, and secure storage solutions to allow for unattended delivery operations with lower levels of human intervention.

The aim of this review is to fill a significant gap in the research by analyzing security integration and theft-proof mechanisms. It does so by placing these elements at the forefront of the analysis, rather than focusing primarily on navigation performance and operation performance like prior reviews only did. This review paper differs in that it

provides a systematic evaluation of Automation Delivery Robots from a security perspective. The novel aspect of this review is that it conducts a comparative and analytical comparison of navigation techniques, control platforms, and security features based on factors such as cost, scalability, computational requirements, accuracy, and real-world application. It will therefore allow for a broader understanding of ADR than has previously been provided by existing reviews. The author reviews several ways to navigate a vehicle (ultrasonic, LiDAR, and Vision). The author also reviews the many general-purpose controllers (Arduino, Raspberry Pi, and NVIDIA Jetson Nano), as well as the many ways to authenticate or control access to systems PINs, RFID tags, QR codes, and Biometrics. The paper divides the anti-theft strategies into three categories: physical, digital, and surveillance, providing a way to understand their strengths and disadvantages.

## II. LITERATURE SURVEY

This section critically reviews existing research on Autonomous Delivery Robots with a focus on system fundamentals, navigation techniques, control platforms, and theft-proof security mechanisms. Unlike descriptive surveys, the discussion emphasizes comparative evaluation, advantages and limitations, and real-world feasibility, aligning with the objectives of a security-centric review [2],[11].

### Fundamentals of Autonomous Delivery Robots

Autonomous Delivery Robots are a set of mobile platforms designed to deliver packages and objects without needing significant human help, using only little or no assistance [2]. A typical ADR architecture consists of the chassis, the mobile drive system and a steering system, a centralized processing unit, navigation and sensing instruments to assist in the navigation, a wireless communication system for transferring and receiving information, a battery storage system and the payload storage compartment, which creates an interlinked structure of parts that allows ADRs to create autonomous paths to navigate and avoid obstacles, determine the delivery location and allow for access to the payload at the destination [12],[7],[8].

Historically, ADRs developed from Automated Guided Vehicles used primarily in industrial warehouses and manufacturing premises. These vehicles followed a set path (e.g. magnetic track or pre-defined markers on the floor) and were designed to move around within highly characterized, controlled environments such as those found in large-warehouses [12],[13]. With the advancements in embedded computing technologies: advancements in low-cost sensing and AI technologies, ADRs are now able to move outside of the structured environment into a semi-structured and unstructured environment [15],[10].

### Navigation and Obstacle-Avoidance Techniques

Navigation accuracy is a critical determinant of delivery reliability, operational safety, and public acceptance of ADRs [2]. The literature identifies three dominant navigation approaches: ultrasonic-based, LiDAR-based, and vision-based navigation systems [7],[8]. Each method presents distinct trade-offs in terms of cost, accuracy, computational complexity, and suitability for real-world deployment [15].

### Comparative Analysis of Navigation Methods

Navigation Method	Advantages	Limitations	Cost	Accuracy	Real-World Feasibility
<b>Ultrasonic</b>	Low cost, low power, simple integration	Blind spots, poor angular resolution, unreliable in crowds	Low	Low–Moderate	Suitable mainly for basic prototypes
<b>LiDAR</b>	High spatial accuracy, robust SLAM capability	High cost, high power consumption	Medium	High	Widely used in commercial ADRs
<b>Vision-based</b>	Rich semantic information, object recognition	Sensitive to lighting, high computation load	High	High (with AI)	Requires powerful processors

**Volume 15, Issue 2, February 2026**

**|DOI: 10.15680/IJIRSET.2026.1502090|**

**Control Platforms and System Architectures**

The onboard control platform plays a pivotal role in determining ADR computational capability, scalability, real-time performance, and security integration [12],[6]. The literature predominantly reports the use of Arduino, Raspberry Pi, and NVIDIA Jetson Nano platforms [2],[10].

**Comparative Analysis of Navigation Methods**

Platform	Advantages	Limitations	Cost	Scalability
<b>Arduino</b>	Low cost, real-time I/O control	Very limited processing capability	Low	Low
<b>Raspberry Pi</b>	Linux OS, camera support, easy prototyping	Performance bottlenecks under AI workloads	Medium	Medium
<b>Jetson Nano</b>	GPU acceleration, AI and vision support	High cost, higher power consumption	High	High

**Anti-Theft and Security Mechanisms**

Security mechanisms in ADRs are commonly categorized into physical security, digital security, and surveillance-based security layers [3],[6]. Effective theft-proof design requires the integration of all three layers rather than reliance on a single mechanism [4],[5].

**Comparative Analysis of Authentication Mechanisms**

Mechanism	Advantages	Limitations	Security Level	Cost
<b>PIN</b>	Simple, low cost	Vulnerable to guessing and shoulder surfing	Low	Low
<b>RFID</b>	Fast, contactless access	Card loss or cloning risk	Medium	Medium
<b>QR Code</b>	App-based, flexible	Susceptible to spoofing	Medium	Low
<b>Biometric</b>	Strong user authentication	Privacy and ethical concerns	High	High

**Cybersecurity, Failure Scenarios, and Privacy**

An important conclusion of this review was how little existing research on the subjects of ADR and Cybersecurity has gone [3],[6]. There is significant recognition of the possibility of someone physically stealing an ADR Device, however there is very little recognition of how ADR Devices can be compromised using hacking, spoofing, replay attacks or DoS attacks [4],[5].

**Comparison with Drone-Based Delivery Systems**

Because of their speed and ability to avoid ground traffic, drone delivery systems have grown in popularity and interest [9],[14]. Research shows, however, that there are numerous challenges facing drone delivery systems including regulatory constraints, limited payload sizes, short flight times, and increased safety risks associated with drone use. Alternatively, ground-based Automated Delivery Robots provide a greater degree of payload security, longer operating times, and would be more plausible for use in areas with high population densities, such as urban and campus environments [1],[2].

**Research Gaps and Challenges**

The literature regarding theft mitigation indicates significant progress in the development of anti-theft technologies, but there are still many challenges that remain unaddressed [11]. Challenges include a lack of access to real-world theft data to validate the effectiveness of anti-theft technologies, an overarching dependence on modelling and simulating anti-theft technologies, the scarcity of research that examines the cybersecurity aspects of anti-theft technologies [3], a failure to assess an anti-theft technology’s response when networks are down [5], the need for research on the privacy issues associated with the use of biometric surveillance technologies [4], concerns about the limitations placed on low-

**Volume 15, Issue 2, February 2026****DOI: 10.15680/IJRSET.2026.1502090**

cost embedded systems [12], a lack of uniform evaluation frameworks for determining security efficacy [6], and a lack of sufficient long-term field testing of anti-theft technologies within existing urban communities [13].

**III. METHODOLOGY OF LITERATURE SELECTION**

A systematic and transparent literature selection methodology was adopted to ensure the relevance, quality, and academic rigor of the reviewed studies. The objective of this methodology was to identify peer-reviewed research that directly addresses the design, navigation, control, and security aspects of Autonomous Delivery Robots, with particular emphasis on theft-proof mechanisms and security-centric system architectures [2],[11].

**Data Sources and Databases**

To ensure that the literature reviewed was of high academic quality and had undergone rigorous peer review, only well-established and reputable academic databases were consulted. The primary sources included IEEE Xplore for research related to cybersecurity, control systems, robotics, and embedded platforms [4], [7], [8]; SpringerLink for studies on autonomous robotics, intelligent systems, and smart city applications [12], [13]; and ScienceDirect (Elsevier) for literature on AI-based robotics, transportation systems, and security studies [1], [6], [14]. In addition, Google Scholar was used for cross-verification to identify additional relevant peer-reviewed articles and ensure comprehensive coverage of the research topic [3], [5], [10].

**Search Strategy and Keywords**

Relevant published reports were obtained using a structured keyword-based search strategy to ensure comprehensive coverage of both technical and security-related aspects of Autonomous Delivery Robots [2], [3]. The selected search terms were designed to capture general ADR technologies as well as security and host-related vulnerabilities and protection mechanisms [6], [11]. Commonly used search phrases included “Autonomous Delivery Robots” [2], “Theft-proof delivery robots” [11], and “Last-mile delivery robotic technologies” [1], [9], along with technical topics such as “Robot navigation and obstacle avoidance” [7], [8], [15]. Security-focused terms such as “ADR security mechanisms” [3], [6], “Cyber security of mobile robots” [3], [4], and “Authentication and access control within delivery robots” [5] were also applied to ensure that relevant cybersecurity and system protection studies were identified and included in the literature review.

**Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

To maintain consistency and ensure high academic quality, specific inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied during the literature selection process. The inclusion criteria comprised peer-reviewed journal articles and conference papers [12], publications written in English, and studies published between 2014 and 2025 [6]. Research focusing on Autonomous Delivery Robots, mobile delivery robots, or closely related autonomous ground vehicles was considered relevant [2], along with papers addressing navigation, control platforms, system architecture, security, or theft-prevention mechanisms [8]. Conversely, the exclusion criteria eliminated non-peer-reviewed articles, blogs, patents, and technical reports lacking academic validation, studies focused exclusively on warehouse Automated Guided Vehicles without relevance to public or semi-structured environments [12], papers lacking technical depth or experimental or simulation-based validation, and duplicate publications identified across multiple databases.

**Article Screening and Selection Process**

The literature selection process took place in stages. First, titles and abstracts were screened to identify unwanted records. Next, full text reviews evaluated the relevance of the record regarding the developed technical method and quality of the methods used; the contribution to ADR Sec. and Systems Designs [2],[11]. From this process, approx. 45 articles from peer-review journals were deemed appropriate for detailed analysis [1],[6].

**Analysis and Synthesis Approach**

The selected studies were analyzed using a comparative and thematic approach rather than simple summarization [6]. The literature was grouped into thematic categories such as navigation techniques, control platforms, anti-theft mechanisms, and cybersecurity considerations [3],[7],[11]. Comparative analysis tables were developed to evaluate advantages, limitations, cost, scalability, accuracy, and real-world feasibility of different approaches [8],[14]. Research gaps and emerging trends were identified through cross-comparison of findings across studies [5],[13].

**IV. ANTI-THEFT AND SECURITY MECHANISMS IN AUTONOMOUS DELIVERY ROBOTS**

Due to the nature of ADRs operating in uncontrolled, unstructured environments, security is one of the most critical requirements for ADR design [2]. ADRs face a variety of security-related risks that traditional warehouse robots do not; these include physical tampering, unauthorized access by physical means, vandalism and a variety of cyber-attacks [3],[6].

**Physical Security Mechanisms**

Physical security mechanisms form the first line of defense against theft and tampering [11]. These mechanisms are designed to prevent or delay unauthorized physical access to the payload compartment and critical system components [6].

**a) Mechanical Locks and Chassis Design**

Various studies indicated that electromechanical locking mechanisms are available as part of a payload compartment's electromechanical locking mechanism [11]. Electromechanical locks typically utilize an electromechanical actuator such as a servo or a solenoid and stay closed until the successful completion of the authentication process [4]. In addition to providing added physical security, reinforced designs of chassis constructed of high strengths materials with the use of tamper resistant fasteners have increased the amount of time and the level of effort needed by an intruder to successfully break into a cabinet or a trailer [12],[6].

**b) Tamper Detection Sensors**

Techniques used to detect tampering include vibration, tilt and enclosure opening sensors [3]. When Tampering is detected, an alarm may be tripped, an alert sent to a Cloud Server or a Safe-Lock Mode entered [11]. Though these mechanisms help to detect theft, false positives due to environmental disturbances present a challenge in high density urban environments [1].

**Digital Security and Authentication Mechanisms**

Digital security mechanisms control access to the payload and system functions using authentication and authorization protocols [4],[5]. The literature identifies several commonly used authentication approaches, each with distinct trade-offs [3],[6].

**Comparative Analysis of Authentication Mechanisms**

Mechanism	Advantages	Limitation	Security Level	Cost
<b>PIN-based</b>	Simple, low cost, easy implementation	Vulnerable to guessing and observation	Low	Low
<b>RFID</b>	Fast and contactless authentication	Card loss, cloning risk	Medium	Medium
<b>QR Code</b>	App-based, flexible deployment	Susceptible to spoofing	Medium	Low
<b>Biometric</b>	Strong identity verification	Privacy and ethical concerns	High	High

Many early prototypes for security systems implement a PIN-based system because it is easy to use; however, its security is limited [4]. Although RFID and QR code-based systems have enhanced usability, they introduce additional risks of token theft or spoofing [5]. Biometric authentication systems (fingerprint and facial recognition) have much stronger levels of security than these methods; however, they create significant questions regarding data privacy, storage of sensitive information, and compliance with regulations [3],[11].

**Surveillance and Monitoring Mechanisms**

Surveillance-based security mechanisms provide situational awareness and post-event analysis capabilities [11]. Cameras, microphones, and environmental sensors are commonly integrated into ADRs to monitor surroundings and record events [2].

**Volume 15, Issue 2, February 2026****| DOI: 10.15680/IJRSET.2026.1502090 |****Onboard Camera Systems**

Vision Sensors provide both navigation and security monitoring [7]. Video recording may be continuous or only trigger on an event to allow for real-time monitoring and video proof of theft or vandalism [11]. The downside of continuous video processing is the need for large amounts of processing and energy on lower-cost platforms (e.g., RPi) [6].

**Cloud-Based Monitoring and Alerts**

Several studies report the use of cloud connectivity to transmit alerts, images, or video streams to centralized monitoring systems [10]. While cloud integration improves response capabilities, it also introduces latency, bandwidth dependence, and cybersecurity vulnerabilities [3],[5].

**Cybersecurity Threats and Failure Scenarios**

A major limitation identified in the literature is the insufficient treatment of cybersecurity risks [3],[6]. ADRs rely heavily on wireless communication for navigation updates, authentication, and monitoring, making them vulnerable to cyber-attacks such as spoofing, replay attacks, and denial-of-service [4],[5].

**Network Connectivity Loss**

Many ADR systems assume continuous network connectivity [10]. However, loss of connectivity can result in incomplete authentication, delayed alerts, or navigation failure [11]. Studies suggest the need for local decision-making and fail-safe modes, such as autonomous return-to-base or lock-down operation during communication outages [6],[13].

**Hacking and Spoofing Attacks**

Spoofing attacks targeting GPS signals, QR codes, or RFID tags pose serious threats [5]. Encrypted communication protocols, secure key management, and authentication validation are recommended but remain under-implemented in many prototypes [4],[3].

**Ethical and Privacy Considerations**

Cameras, biometric sensors, and cloud monitoring create a large array of ethical and privacy issues for people in public spaces [3],[11]. The continuous collection of a person's data may infringe upon the individual's privacy if not properly handled [5]. Data minimization, secure data storage, anonymization, and compliance with regional data protection regulations have been recognized by authors as key concepts to consider [4],[6]. In most cases, these concepts are not included in the technical literature and are necessary for obtaining the public's acceptance of the data collection and for receiving regulatory approval [2],[14].

**V. CONCLUSION**

The overall theme of this literature review is the development of autonomous delivery robots (ADRs). Specifically, we presented a detailed literature review covering the current state of the art regarding ADRs with respect to the design of theft-proof systems. The findings of our study are more comprehensive than previous surveys of the literature.

In total, approximately forty-five peer-reviewed studies published from 2014-2025 were reviewed. The data obtained from these studies was utilized to compare ADR navigation techniques, ADR control platforms, ADR system architecture and ADR multi-layer security mechanisms that are currently being implemented in industrial and commercial deployments of ADRs.

The analysis of control platforms found that Arduino-based systems (low-end cost-effective systems) provide a low-cost and reliable option for basic control but lack the computing power needed to perform necessary work for perception-driven security and navigation tasks. Academically, Raspberry Pi-based platforms are by far the most flexible and preferred for use as control platforms because they support Linux; however, in terms of capabilities, they often run into performance bottlenecks when performing real-time vision processing or encryption workloads. On the other hand, GPU-based control platforms, such as NVIDIA Jetson Nano, are capable of performing advanced perception tasks, enabling AI-based threat detection, and allow users to perform secure processing. Therefore, these platforms are more effective for ADR applications that require scalability and security and tend to be more expensive and consume more power than the other two options.

In terms of security, the review indicates that using a single level of anti-theft protection in a public environment is insufficient. Using PINs and Token-based authentication may not be able to adequately protect a device against theft or

**Volume 15, Issue 2, February 2026****| DOI: 10.15680/IJRSET.2026.1502090 |**

spoofing-type attacks. Literature supports the use of multi-factor authentication strategies that combine physical lock, digital authentication, surveillance and encrypted communication as the most effective device theft prevention methods. The major contribution of this review article is its identification of critical research voids that hinder the advancement of ADR technology. Examples of these voids are the lack of publicly available actual theft database(s) of ADRs, a limited number of studies evaluating cybersecurity threats (e.g., denial-of-service attacks, spoofing), and a lack of a single universal evaluation framework(s) from which to evaluate ADR security.

The framework and analytical approaches discussed in this review will allow for the creation of a secure, operational, and reliable environment for future research regarding ADRs, design and implement standards for their infrastructure, and deploy them safely on a large scale in real-world applications. Thus, filling the above-stated gaps will be paramount for enabling the safe, trusted, and large-scale adoption of ADRs within our real-world environments.

**REFERENCES**

1. Boysen, N., Fedtke, S. and Schwerdfeger, S. (2020) 'Last-mile delivery concepts: A survey from an operational research perspective', *Sustainability*, 12(2), p. 646. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020646>
2. Chen, J., Chen, D., Zhang, J. and Li, Q. (2020) 'Autonomous delivery robots: A survey', *IEEE Access*, 8, pp. 207268–207285. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3038668>
3. Alves, M., Rocha, A. and Dias, J. (2022) 'Cybersecurity for mobile robots: A survey', *Sensors*, 22(5), p. 1923. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/s22051923>
4. Sharma, P., Chen, M.Y. and Park, J.H. (2021) 'Secure authentication for IoT-based robotics systems', *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(12), pp. 10155–10165. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2021.3053278>
5. Roman, R., Zhou, J. and Lopez, J. (2013) 'On the features and challenges of security and privacy in distributed Internet of Things', *Computer Networks*, 57(10), pp. 2266–2279. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2012.12.018>
6. Yin, H., Berger, C. and Saxena, N. (2019) 'Robotics security: Challenges and solutions', *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 120, p. 103264. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.robot.2019.103264>
7. Ding, W., Wang, J. and Shen, S. (2018) 'Visual SLAM for autonomous ground robots', *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 34(6), pp. 1504–1518. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TRO.2018.2861448>
8. Zhang, T. and Qiu, R.C. (2019) 'Autonomous ground vehicle navigation using LiDAR', *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 19(21), pp. 10003–10012. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2019.2927913>
9. Macrina, G., Pugliese, L., Guerriero, F. and Laporte, G. (2017) 'Drone-aided routing for last-mile delivery', *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 82, pp. 302–325. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.06.006>
10. Khan, Z.A., Anjum, A. and Soomro, K. (2018) 'Internet of Things based smart logistics using autonomous vehicles', *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 87, pp. 100–111. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2018.05.003>
11. Ferrari, P., Flammini, A., Sisinni, E. and Rinaldi, S. (2023) 'Security and privacy in autonomous delivery robots', *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, 109, p. 48. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10846-023-01789-6>
12. Siciliano, B. and Khatib, O. (2016) *Springer Handbook of Robotics*. 2nd edn. Cham: Springer. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32552-1>
13. Pallottino, L., Scordio, V.G., Bicchi, A. and Frazzoli, E. (2011) 'Decentralized cooperative policy for conflict resolution in multivehicle systems', *Autonomous Robots*, 32(2), pp. 155–171. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10514-011-9268-2>
14. Hassanalian, M. and Abdelkefi, A. (2017) 'Classifications, applications, and design challenges of drones', *Progress in Aerospace Sciences*, 91, pp. 99–131. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paerosci.2017.04.003>
15. Thrun, S. et al. (2006) 'Stanley: The robot that won the DARPA Grand Challenge', *Journal of Field Robotics*, 23(9), pp. 661–692. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/rob.20147>



INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD  
SERIAL  
NUMBER  
INDIA



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  [ijirset@gmail.com](mailto:ijirset@gmail.com)



[www.ijirset.com](http://www.ijirset.com)

Scan to save the contact details