

Externalities - Review of group 11

Reviewed by group 14

Summary

The authors start the paper by explaining the findings in assignment 2 and new insights derived from several papers. They then divide the paper into 2 research questions:

1. What is the impact of the governmental countermeasure ‘Legislation aimed at mitigating the amount of hacked websites?’ and
2. What are the factors influencing the number of attacks on domains hosted by EU countries and what is their impact on the security performance of those EU countries?”

The first research question is answered in the context of all three actors that have been chosen. It is divided into many subsections, making it a very detailed answer to the research question. The second research question is answered by performing a statistical analysis, using linear regression & pearson correlation techniques. Both research questions are summarized at the end of the subsection and at the end of the paper, a conclusion is written to summarize the paper as a whole.

Strengths

- The statistical analysis is very well-performed and elaborate. They elaborate on the steps performed and the software used, and logical and quantitative conclusions are drawn from the results and presented in a clear and comprehensive manner.
- Overall, the paper is very detailed and has a paper-like setup. It is very structured and everything is described extensively. A lot of references have been used to support the claims and explanations.
- A lot of different, useful factors possibly influencing the metrics are identified including, in many cases, data sets to be used for the assessment.

Major issues

- Section 2: Too many of the countermeasures are sourced from the plans of the new cabinet and upcoming legislations. While it is interesting to include some of them, these countermeasures have probably already been assessed by the corresponding regulators. It would have been nice to see more contributions of your own.
- Section 2: Only a few, but very similar externalities are mentioned. Are there not more externalities impacting possibly other actors?

Minor issues

- Some sentences contain a lot of (not always necessary) references making it harder to read. For instance, in the the introduction there is a sentence mentioning '(Charalambous et al. ,) assignment 1' four times.
- A lot of phrases and sentences saying almost the same thing. For instance, "The results have shown that some countries are more vulnerable to hacker attacks than others [...]. This means, more domains that are hosted by these specific countries have been hacked".
- Long sentences. For example: "According to Dutch law Burgerlijk Wetboek (BW 6, art. 196c, 2017), which was amended to account for the implementation of the European E-commerce Directive, third parties who pass on information from others or provide access to a communications network cannot be held liable for information, if they do not initiate the relaying of the information, do not decide who the information will be passed onto, and if they did not select or amend the information which was relayed".
- Several grammar/spelling issues, eg. "poprosedals" (introduction) and "[...] learning customers to handle cyber risks [...]" (section 2.1).
- Paper is very long and includes more answers than was required in the assignment. This is not an issue per se, but it made it harder to finish the review in time.