Peer-review form [Lab 3]

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, Samuel Pettersson

We have reviewed the report of: Group 14

General

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

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

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?

The succinct step-by-step descriptions make it *easy* to replicate the results.

Having the text for each machine divided into subsections with appropriate headings makes it easy to get an overview of what was done.

What can be improved?

All the steps taken to hack the machines are given, but more careful explanations and justifications of them would have made it easier to follow the report. The explanations for the last machine were most welcome, but they could have been placed before the step-by-step procedure or referred to therein.