

# Peer Review - Group 6

Reviewed by group 9

## Summary

In this report, the authors has put their focus on four different actors: Registrars, End users and business, Third party security providers and governments. For each actor, a countermeasure is given. For registrars, the countermeasure is to unregister malicious domains. However this countermeasure is infeasible when other registrars do not do anything to lower the amount of malware droppers. For End users and Businesses, trainings can be given. The authors has discussed that awareness training is a much cheaper option. The countermeasure for Third Party Security Provider is to hand out seals to companies, in order to show that the company can be trusted. However, these seals can also be falsified and it can trick users to trust malicious sites. The countermeasure of the government is to create new regulations, but it is hard to implement it globally. The authors has discussed the amount of viruses released per month could be a cause for the variance in their metric. Another cause could be the amount of generic TLD that are being used. The authors have discovered from their statistical analysis, that the amount of generic TLDs are correlated with the amount of malicious domains.

## Strengths of the assignment

- Authors gave a concrete countermeasure for each actor.
- Authors did two analysis and reflected on their analysis
- Conclusion is well written: easy to find the the most important results that were discussed in the paper.
- Explain how the benefit of a countermeasure can influence negatively on other actors.

## Major Issues

- It seems like that the authors only focused on costs that are related with money and not other possible costs.
- Not sure how unregistering a malicious could lower the amount of malware dropper domains, attackers can always switch to another domain?

- We think that awareness trainings could have effect on other people: they can share their knowledge to the society and this can influence the society to be more aware
- Not very explicit on how externalities are related to the costs and benefits of the countermeasure.

## Minor Issues

- Not sure why the authors has analysed four actors instead of three, and no explanation was given.
- Some weird sentences e.g. “*This tactic would be perform highly...*” and “*the customer will not be refunded the registration price....*” .
- Some small grammatical mistakes e.g unfeasible
- Incentives are stated in the conclusion instead of the section about the actor