Thank you for agreeing to be a reviewer. We are keen to ensure a high standard of papers for this conference. We are eager to help authors who may not yet have achieved a suitable skill in writing academic papers to the necessary quality. To this end we would be grateful if you would, wherever possible, provide constructive advice as to how they can make the paper more acceptable for presentation at a quality academic conference.

Please complete the table below and rate the paper on the issues described. As with all double-blind reviewing any comments you make will be passed to the authors on an anonymous basis.

**We try to give feedback to authors within 2 weeks. Please try to complete the review within that time.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer reference | 037 | Review Due Date | 25/10/2019 |
| Paper Title | Fingerprinting Vehicles With CAN Bus Data Samples | | |
| Conference Track | Main | Submission Type | Academic |

To check the relevance of the paper you may like to consult the call for papers which you can find here:

[**https://www.academic-conferences.org/conferences/iccws/iccws-call-for-papers/**](https://www.academic-conferences.org/conferences/iccws/iccws-call-for-papers/)

Which category or categories best describes this paper:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Empirical research | x |
| Theoretical paper that advances/challenges/adapts current theory |  |
| Theoretical paper reviewing and/or synthesising current theory |  |
| Other - please specify |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Please rate the following: (5 excellent, 1 poor)** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **N/A** |
| 1 | Relevance to the themes of this conference | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Contribution to academic debate |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Structure of the paper |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Standard of English – indicate below if you think the paper needs proof-reading | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Appropriateness and number of keywords/key phrases |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Appropriateness of the research/study method |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Literature review adequately provided |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| 9 | Relevance and clarity of drawings, graphs and tables |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Results and findings adequately reported |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Discussion and conclusions |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Reference list, adequate and correctly cited |  |  | x |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Taking into consideration the type of submission and the track the paper has been submitted to (see above), please give an overall rating out of 10 for this paper in terms of its contribution to this conference. |  |

Can this paper be accepted for presentation at the conference?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes - no changes |  | Yes - with minor revisions | x | Yes - with major revisions |  | No |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Specific reviewer comments to be passed to the author/s. *Please expand on any weak areas in the checklist and offer specific advice in the space overleaf as to how the author(s) may improve the paper.* ***Some comment is required please.*** |

|  |
| --- |
| This paper demonstrates how established machine learning techniques can be used to identify operating data from a unique vehicle, given a large data set from a group of vehicles. It contributes material confirmation of theoretical vulnerabilities in the controller area network (CAN) that are present in contemporary motor vehicles. The work goes further by comparing the accuracy in two different machine learning techniques in disclosing unique data. This is good solid interesting work, a definite contribution that should attract and hold an audience at the conference.  The quality of the work is good. It uses secondary data and well known “big data” style approaches to develop the compromise. The techniques are clearly explained, making good use of tables and figures. The text is easy-to-read and well organized.  Issues:  In defense of the authors, this is a lot to explain in a restricted page limitation conference. However, it is always unsatisfying to elaborate a vulnerability without discussing (a) how and why this might be compromised, and (b) how the vulnerability can be addressed. Without such a discussion, it leaves the reader with a feeling of hopelessness. In terms of (a), the paper seems to suggest that hijacking is our biggest problem, when privacy compromise is likely the premier compromise. In terms of (b) what adjustments might be made through the ISO 11898 standards that could eliminate this vulnerability? The authors, no doubt have better ideas, but a brief paragraph would help brighten a reader’s day.  Minor:  Briefly explain why the capture\_id and vehicle\_id in the data do not themselves uniquely identify the vehicle, otherwise the reader may assume that the whole machine learning enterprise is redundant. |