Peer-review form [Lab 2]

Secure Computer Systems I, Spring 2014

Sofia Cassel

For each question, check the appropriate box. Write your positive and negative comments in the appropriate text fields in the 'Comments' section (see next page).

Important: All reports deserve comments. If the report was great, encourage your fellow students by writing positive comments. If the report was not so good, help them by writing both positive and negative comments!

About you

Reviewers: Group 12: Ren Li, Tianyao Ma, and Samuel Pettersson

We have reviewed the report of: Group 9

General

How easy is the report to follow?   Very difficult ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ Very easy

How good is the language?   Very bad ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ Very good
(i.e., with respect to spelling and grammatical errors)

Are references used correctly   No ☐   To some extent ☑   Yes ☐
(according to the specifications)?   (specify in Comments)

Theoretical questions

Are all assumptions made by the author(s) clearly stated?   No ☐   Some of them ☑   Yes ☐
(according to the specifications)?   (specify in Comments)

Do the answers have a logical structure,   No ☐   To some extent ☐   Yes ☑
i.e., does the conclusion follow from the stated premises?   (specify in Comments)

How well are the answers, in general, motivated?   Very badly ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ Very well

Lab questions

Are all necessary steps described and explained,   No ☐   Some of them ☐   Yes ☑
so that you can replicate the results?   (specify in Comments)

How well are the results stated and explained   Very badly ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑ Very well
by the author(s)?

If there were any errors or problems, are they stated   No ☐   To some extent ☐   Yes ☑
and discussed by the author(s)?   (specify in Comments)

Comments

What was good about the report?

Overall easy to follow thanks to elaborate description of the theoretical parts.

Very clear step-by-step instructions for the practical parts that make it easy to replicate.

References were plentiful, so reading up carefully on some part is easy; just follow the reference.

What can be improved?

There were several unnecessary spelling mistakes which proofreading could remove.

There was a reference missing in task 2, but other than that, the references were top-notch

Motivate why the scheme explained in task 5 a makes use of capabilities (rather than access control lists)

The fact （"assumption"）that Base64 encoding can be decoded easily is not obvious to the reader and should be mentioned explicitly