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

Answer the following questions in free text.

1. How to evaluate the selection of the topic? The topic seems a natural choice considering the previous work of the author.
2. How to evaluate general presentation style?
   The style is good. Possibly writing out the definitions of properties in normal language first might be helpful to someone who is not at home in that field, but other than that everything is good.
3. How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?
   Seems adequate – just enough to show what is being proved and why it is important, plus of course the proof.
4. How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?
   It is good. Nothing to improve there.
5. What was new and interesting to me in the paper?
   Just about everything – I had seen a presentation of the previous seminar thesis of the author, which explained some concepts, but I didn't really remmember much of that.
6. What else would I have liked to read?

   Hard to say. A conclusion might have been nice.

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

1. The paper has the following misprints:
   Didn't find any.
2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:
   "the if the" in the introduction.
3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:
   Didn't see any.
4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting:
   Didn't notice any.
5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:
   Statistical and perfect properties might be explained together for all protocols instead of

separately for each of them.

6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.):
   Everything seemed to be there.

7. The following elements could be removed from the paper:
   Nothing seemed redundant.

8. Other comments: