

Peer Review: DNS Sinkholing for the Downstream Consumer

Writing

The paper was pretty well written and most grammatical errors were minor and would easily be found if the author reads over the paper carefully. I did find that there were multiple instances where the author switched the tense. This made for many logical errors early in the paper where the author is explaining the background information. It was hard to keep track of the tense in which the paper was being written and this caused many convoluted sentences. The author does a good job stating their position and it is articulated well throughout the paper. The thesis is very clear and easy to find. I would also suggest to the author that they should try to explain DNS sinkholing a little more thoroughly because it was kind of hard to understand and I had to look it up online in order to understand the topic. I think that adding a little more background information will help the reader understand the project a little better. I wasn't really sure of the importance of DNS sinkholing and why it would be so beneficial.

References

The author did have the required amount of references. I had a hard time finding them within the paper due to the fact that the author used one word names for the in-text citations. I would suggest using the first three words of the article or adding the year the article was published in order to distinguish the reference and allow the reader to find references more easily. I am not quite sure what type of citations the author used but I do not think that there was any sort of style for the citations. For example, the reference used to cite something about the faculty member had the citation of (Marymount University) but in the reference page the

reference is listed as: Dr. Diane Murphy (2014). I think that the author should spend a little time finding a citation style they would like to use and updating the citations to match this style so there is no confusion as to how the references are cited.

Tables and Figures

The author does a good job of presenting the data that was collected in a chart that was very easy to read. The author also had a good diagram of the time frame required in order to run this experiment.

Format

The paper was very well formatted and it was easy to navigate. I am not sure if the author had a linkable table of contents but that might be a nice addition since the paper has multiple sections. I am not sure if this was not present due to the conversion to a PDF for the review but it would be a nice touch to add just so the paper is easier to navigate. Another tip would be to start the numbering of pages after the table of contents. This will make it easier on the reader since the numbering will begin where the actual paper begins. I would also add more to the header and footer.

Topic

I think the topic is very interesting and doable in one semester. The author has done a good job of getting most of the work done and presented in a neat format. The data that was gathered seemed to be inconclusive but the author can use this to back up their thesis by

showing the challenges that he/she faced throughout the process. The author does a good job of explaining the project and detailing how it will be completed.

Length

The author met all the requirements and the paper was well written and structured. The sections on DNS sinkholing could be expanded to explain a little more in depth how the process works.

Intellectual Content

I believe the author had a good understanding of DNS sinkholing and they did a good job of expanding on the topic. The references were concise and few. There was a lot that was the authors own work and the paper should a good level of understanding on how DNS sinkholing works and the importance of implementation.

Overall I thought this was a great paper and it was very well written and it showed that the author spent a good amount of time working on this. I look forward to seeing the final presentation at the end of the semester.