

Paper evaluation form

Title: Practical security analysis: The distribution of attack trees.

Author: Lauri Rätsep

Evaluation criterion	No	Rather no than yes	More or less	Rather yes than no	Yes
The paper is well readable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
Language used in the paper is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
The paper is logical and well structured	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
The general typeset of the paper is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
The paper was interesting to read	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
The paper gives a good overview of the topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
The material in the paper is mathematically correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
References to the external sources are presented correctly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
All the relevant references are present	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+
The formulae are typed correctly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	+

Answer the following questions in free text.

1. How to evaluate the selection of the topic?
I read it as software security specialist. As security analysis for software development is quite new and not very mature, attack trees seem to have important and effective way to analyse also software security.
2. How to evaluate general presentation style?
Very good.
3. How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?
Sufficient for this paper. But for future progress probably more papers, articles, books should be studied.
4. How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?
It is OK.
5. What was new and interesting to me in the paper?
I am a little bit familiar with attack trees, but not much. So everything was interesting to read and think of.
6. What else would I have liked to read?
Implementing attack trees in real life, analysing real systems. Having models is good, but finding unknown pre-defined constants that have influence to result is mysterious part.

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

1. The paper has the following misprints:
Did not notice any.

2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:
3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:
4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting:
5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:
6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.):
7. The following elements could be removed from the paper:
8. Other comments:
It would be nice, if Peeter Laud will name his documents more describing names than "Unnamed document".