Comment Group 10's Draft from Group 1

1. Scientific/practical merit: correctness, accuracy, significance, and non-triviality:-

- Although the research problem is a valid security concern, this paper explain much about how the problem is formulated.
- The paper suggests in the introduction, that Android system has traded security for availability, but does not explain how it is done. A good approach would be to compare it with the available alternatives like Apple's to see how a closed but more secure ecosystem defers from Android.
- The paper suggests that the Google Play Store is "open source", which is not correct.
- Although the problem statement is repeated several times in different sections, it is not described thoroughly how repackaging works with regards to Android apps.
- Usage of digital signatures is Android packages is not mentioned. There are also other security mechanisms in place in the Android system to prevent apps from getting misused by malicious actors. These mechanisms should be reviewed with regards to the problem, and it should be stated why these mechanisms are not effective against the mentioned attack.
- Three pass protocol and the Massey-Omura algorithm are mentioned as a solution, but the paper doesn't describe how they work in detail and how they can help with the problem.

2. Presentation: clarity, organization, and English usage:-

- Introduction, Description, and Malware in Open Source contained very similar content. Perhaps it would be better to combine them in a longer introduction section.

- Repackaging Attack could have its own section to describe how it helps malicious actors to publish their malwares.
- The paper needs to be checked for grammatical and spelling errors