

Peer Review Guide

Read the entire draft paper you have been assigned. Answer each of the following questions with a few sentence responses. Your entire Peer Review should amount to 2 pages of written text.

A. Title

1. Is there a title? Does the title adequately describe what the draft is about?

Me: Yes, there is a title (Cybersecurity and Online Privacy: Impact of Content Filtering and Blacklisting on Cyber Security and Online Privacy.), and it adequately describes the content of the draft because the attention is on only these two concepts.

B. Main Points

1. List the main points made in the draft, in order that they are presented in the paper.

Me: The main points made in this draft (in the order they were presented) were:

- The paper's objective and/or thesis: to determine the influence of content filtering and blacklisting.

•

2. Which main points need more support? (more evidence, more tables/figures, more references, etc.)

- Filtering may be one in need of more explanation.

•

3. Which main points (if any) should be eliminated, as they do not contribute to the overall theme of the paper?

there is no need to eliminate any of this paper's main points)

4. Are the main points out of order? If so, how would you reorder the paper?

- I would do the ethical standards portion of the paper at the beginning because it carries an enormous heavy load on the cybercrime scenario.

C. Citations

1. Are there at least 10 references?

Me: Yes, there are more than 10 references.

2. Is each of the references cited at least once in the paper?

Me: Yes, they are.

3. Is the APA style of in-text citations and references used?

Me: Yes, it is APA style of in-text citations

D. Wording and Formatting

1.If technical jargon is used, is it defined and explained clearly?

Me: No, this paper would benefit more if the author would add a glossary to help readers to understand certain terms. At least a simple footnote would have added enough help for any novice to understand better what he is talking about.

2.Is the paper readable by a novice in the field?

Me: If we are talking about a college student with the basic knowledge of technology, I would say maybe.

3.Is the paper at least 10 pages?

Me: Yes, it is.

4.Are the sections and headings appropriate for the content within them?

Me: I found the paper very well structured and organized. Excellent in communication style in general.

E. Final Thoughts

1.In two to three sentences describe the thesis of this paper?

- To determine the influence of content filtering and blacklisting.
- How to detect any malicious threat
- Advice to users on how to protect their data

2.After reading the paper, is the thesis supported?

Me: I think it felt a bit short. It feels like it was a bit “rushed.”

3.What kinds of information, if any, are missing?

Me: The mention of the influence of content filtering and blacklisting on online privacy was insufficient to be able to support his thesis. We, the people studying this area of technology know that there is more than content filtering and blacklisting. Maybe, if an explanation about all the issues about protecting data online would have been mentioned in the first paragraph of this paper, and then proceed to discuss just these two, it would have helped to understand the entire scenario of data breaches or cyber-attacks.

4.What was the single most important thing said in the paper?

Me: The discussion of the applications for insuring all data (Pages 4-8) was good, but it felt “rushed.”