Comment Group 2's Draft from Group 1

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

- The related work is good and lengthy.
- The authors should try to get more recent papers/references within the past 5 years; as big data systems is a fast growing area of interest. This will help their report to be updated with the latest methods and strategies being used.
- The authors should try to explain more about the algorithms or methods they intend on using to tackle this problem.

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

- There were some typo and grammar errors that we spotted while we were reading the paper. e.g., the first paragraph of the introduction has some grammatical errors, and more.
- We didn't find the section for the detailed description of the topic, and the thoughts and remarks on how to use one/more of the algorithms and protocols to achieve the security requirements.
- The authors did not clearly explain the methods they plan on using or implementing; this is one of the most important part of a good report.

Comment Group 4's Draft from Group 1

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

- The detailed description of the topic was good and explained explicitly. It would be easy for anyone to understand and follow.
- The authors did a great job at giving a general overview about Bluetooth and how it works.
- The authors did not explicitly clarify which algorithms they would be using to solve the defined problem. This can be improved on.

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

- There were some typo and grammar errors that we spotted while we were reading the paper.
- More than 40% of the references had no year or timestamp. The reference formatting could be improved. This is one of the most important part of a good report.
- The authors should try to get more recent papers/references within the past 5 years. This will help their report to be updated with the latest methods and strategies being used.

Comment Group 6's Draft from Group 1

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

- The paper contains only the related works to the topics at hand. There are no sections for the abstract, introduction, detailed description of the topic, thoughts and remarks on how to use the algorithms and protocols in class to achieve some security requirements, and the references.
- The authors did not describe what approach they would use to solve the considered problem.
- We couldn't get a clear picture of what the authors would like to do or which algorithm they would like to implement.

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

- There were some typo and grammar errors that we spotted while we were reading the paper.
- The authors could do a better job at organizing their report with all the necessary sections. Anyone should be able to understand what's going on in the report even if he is from a different area.

Comment Group 7's Draft from Group 1

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

   - Paper provided a main focus on privacy and integrity of data however as the report progresses on, their focus shifted to general security issues regarding the cloud and Internet-of-Things (IoT). As a result, related works were focused on that instead of privacy and integrity.

   - Concise background was provided establishing the relationship between the cloud and IoT and their importance to e-Health.

   - Paper also gave accurate description of the relevance of the CIA triad (confidentiality, integrity and availability) to e-Health.

   - Paper did mention some encryption algorithms that were used by related works but were not strong on the discussion about implementation and feasibility of their works.

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

   - There were some minor typographical errors and spelling mistakes that needed to be addressed.

   - The paper flowed quite well from background, problems, related works and conclusion.

Comment Group 8's Draft from Group 1

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

   - Paper talks about CIA issues from the e-Voting point of view and also mentions other issues such as coercion which is very relevant in voting.

   - Paper's prime focus was on coercion in e-Voting and suggests the use of blind signatures using RSA while presenting relative works and their short comings to buttress their objectives which was very well written.

   - Paper also mentions the impact of passive and active attacks on e-Voting in a concise manner.

   - Paper however did not describe the process of coercion for readers to get some idea about how it is done in e-Voting.

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

   - Algorithm presented was not in the proper format so it was very difficult to confirm the accuracy of their algorithm.

   - There were some minor typographical errors and spelling mistakes that needed to be addressed.

   - The paper flowed quite well from background, problems, related works and conclusion.

Comment Group 3's Draft from Group 1

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

   - Related works section was not clear. It was very difficult to determine whether solutions provided were from papers that the authors read or from the authors themselves.

   - Also related work described general information about e-Voting, did not specify how other researchers solved the problems cited, algorithms they proposed and the feasibility of it. The details provided were high-level.

   - Proposed algorithm seemed generic but was difficult to tell due to the formatting.

   - Paper however did not describe the process of coercion for readers to get some idea about how it is done in e-Voting.

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

   - Algorithm presented was not in the proper format so it was very difficult to confirm the accuracy of their algorithm.

   - There were some minor typographical errors and spelling mistakes that needed to be addressed.

   - The paper flowed quite well from background, problems, related works and conclusion.

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

Comment Group 5's Draft from Group 1

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

- The introduction section is a nicely written and is sufficiently detailed.
- The second paragraph of Related Work, contains a lot of information that are not detailed sufficiently, making it harder to understand. For example, the BTS model is mentioned, but there isn't any definition of it.
- The section Limitations is not clear enough. It can't be understood by someone that is not familiar with the ideas mentioned beforehand.
- There are no new ideas described and evaluated in this paper.

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

- Structure of the paper has some issues. Definitions of P-RBAC entities were not immediately after the introduction of P-RBAC and there were some non-related sections in between.
- There were some grammatical and spelling errors that need to be checked.
- There were enough papers in reference that had a recent publish date to make sure the authors are up to date.

Comment Group 9's Draft from Group 1

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

- Structure of the paper has some issues. Definitions of P-RBAC entities were not immediately after the introduction of P-RBAC and there were some non-related sections in between.
- There were enough papers in reference that had a recent publish date to make sure the authors are up to date.
- There were some grammatical and spelling errors that need to be checked.

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

- References don't follow the same format.
- Citations are not correct and need to be managed better.
- Figures are excessively used and are unnecessary for the subjects that the accompanied.
- There are some grammatical and spelling errors that need to be checked.