

Peer review protocol - kexjobbsopposition

Authors: Jonas Hulthén & Thea Nöteberg

Report: Goat Farm: Learning by hacking

.....

Reviewer/opponent: Dilvan Sabir

Date: 2022-05-25

Provide a concise summary of the research presented in the report

Start from a short description of the content (2-3 sentences) and the approach adopted by the authors (e.g. data analysis, simulation/model, experiment, theoretical study; 1-2 sentences).

What constitutes the author's main contribution and what makes this work interesting/special? (2-3 sentences)

The purpose of the report was to generate new hacking challenges using CloudGoat, which is an AWS vulnerable by design deployment tool.

The approach was "design science research"

The work is interesting because it shows that you can generate dynamic hacking challenges.

Title and abstract

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 1-2 sentences.

The title is eye-catching; however, it does not say much about the report's contents

The abstract reflects the contents of the report.

Although the writing could be more academic, leave less room for misinterpretation. "and to not fall behind this report proposes" missing a comma here.

Introduction – problem statement

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 3-4 sentences.

- The research question could be more specific, in my opinion.
- The project aim is well stated.
- The scope is well delineated; however, you could elaborate further on why certain restrictions were adopted. For instance, why "Cloud_breach_s3"? Why focus only on modifying IAM instances?

Background information and related work (state of the art)

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 2-3 sentences.

- Good information, though it feels like some of the things that we find out in this chapter, we should have known about before reading the scope and problem statement.
- Good job incorporating related works. It seems you have a good grasp of the relevant works in the field.

Methods

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 2-3 sentences.

- The use of tools could be further motivated and provided with a source (regarding many companies moving to AWS)
- I loved the use of flowcharts. Made it really intuitive to follow along.
- A more elaborate explanation for why the difficulty and the size were chosen.

Results (objective observations)

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 3-4 sentences.

- I really liked the diagram; however, wouldn't it be more appropriate to place it in the methods section?
- The structure here is a bit messy; it could be explained more.
- I'm unfamiliar with this type of work but there does not seem to be much numbers oriented results to analyze with respect to different statistical methods etc.

Discussion and conclusions (subjective analysis and perspective)

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 3-4 sentences.

- In the discussion chapter, you refer to a study, but you refer instead to the introduction section, please refer to the study directly.
- The discussion needs to be more rigorous and concern itself more with the implications of this specific report.
- What are some direct and indirect implications of this work? I feel like this section was largely left out.

Overall characteristics (coherence, presentation style, structure, language)

You could follow the evaluation guideline in *rapportprotokoll* (checklist for report evaluation) – ca. 4-5 sentences.

Do not write this in the form of a list of mistakes. For example, point out misspellings and minor errors only if they are examples of recurrent mistakes. You could additionally offer the authors your comments/notes (annotations made in the report document).

-The language could be a bit improved in certain areas so that the point that the authors are trying to convey is more clear. Right now, some of the wording makes it at times difficult to decipher the intentions of the authors and the point they are trying to convey.

-The structure can also be refined further to be a bit easier to follow. At times, the red thread is lost. So you lose coherence at times.

Otherwise, the report is really interesting.

In summary, what was your overall reception of the report (balance positive and negative remarks – point out both weaknesses and strengths)?

What are your recommendations for improvement?

Do not just list your remarks and recommendations but describe them in a communicative and coherent way following an academic style of writing (just like in your reports), at least 5-6 sentences.

Strengths

- The work is very interesting, it is very captivating and also has many implications.
- It is largely done; it just needs a bit of polish here and there.
- The charts are really informative and easy to grasp.

Weaknesses

- Writing needs to be made more academic and also more coherent, with less room for misinterpretation.
- Structure needs to be looked at in order to make the report easier to follow along, I feel like parts of the report can be organized differently.
- More focus on results and method. As a reader, I want to be able to completely understand what the authors did and how they did it. Right now, it feels a bit abstract.