CSC 790, Computer Security Seminar

Review Form for:

feel free to score in: rainbows, hugs, or beardies

1. Originality and Importance:

1:Poor - No discernable contribution to the field

2:Fair - Minor contribution

3:Average - Small but clear contribution

4:Very Good - Significant contribution

5:Excellent - Major contribution to the field

4,

2. Relevance (to this course):

1:Out of Scope

2:Less than average

3:Average

4:More than average

5:Highly Relevant

5,

3.Technical Content:

1:Poor

2:Fair

3:Average

4:Very Good

5:Excellent

3,

4. Organization and Presentation:

1:Unacceptable

2:Poor

3:Average

4:Good

5:Excellent

4,

5. Reference to Related Work:

1:Unacceptable

2:Poor

3:Average

4:Good

5:Excellent

5,

6. Overall Recommendation (if submitted to a conference):

1:Strong Reject - I have strong arguments against acceptance

2:Weak Reject - I will not fight strongly against it

3:Neutral

4:Weak Accept - I will not fight strongly in favour of acceptance

5:Strong Accept - I have strong arguments in favour of acceptance

4, they did quite well on what they are talking about.

7. Summary of the paper

8. What are the major strengths of this paper?

1. very detailed in almost everything about spam

2. I like those nice pictures

9. What are the major shortcomings of this paper?

1. I didn't see much shortcomings except a little bit too long

2. There is not one or two clear focus, they kind of trying to include everything

10. Comments for the authors

11. Comments for the editors of this special issue (answer will

not be sent to the authors)