

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

<b>Student Matriculation No.</b>	<b>Glasgow</b> 2407996 <b>DCU</b> 18114415 <b>Charles</b> 95801502
<b>Dissertation Title</b>	Cyber Threat Intelligence: A Proposal of a Threat Intelligence Cycle from an Enterprise perspective

### INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

<b>Reviewer 1 Initial Grade</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>	<b>Reviewer 2 Initial Grade</b> <i>Select from drop down list</i>	<b>Late Submission Penalty</b> <i>no penalty</i>
<b>Word Count Penalty</b> (1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)		
<b>Word Count:</b> 23 777 <b>Suggested Penalty:</b> no penalty		

### JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

**Final Agreed Mark.** (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).

**Before Penalty:** C2 [13]      **After Penalty:** C2 [13]

### DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
<b>A. Structure and Development of Answer</b>	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Good
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Weak
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Poor
<b>B. Use of Source Material</b>	
This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• <i>Evidence of reading and review of published literature</i>	Good
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Satisfactory
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Very Good
<b>C. Academic Style</b>	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Very Good
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Very Good
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not required

## IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- *Appropriate word count*

Yes

### ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### **Reviewer 1**

The presented research focuses on the analysis of cyber threat intelligence in the context of small and medium enterprises. Even though interesting, the dissertation suffers from several, and unfortunately fundamental, shortcomings. First, the connection to Security Studies is rather tenuous, as there is hardly any discernible connection to the disciplinary literature. Second, relatedly the dissertation then lacks a proper researcher design, which shows mostly as missing a proper method of analysis. Leaving aside these criteria, the analysis offers only a description of various notions connected to cyber threat intelligence, without actually showing their relevance for small and medium enterprises. Apart from the lack of a disciplinary connection, this is the second biggest problem because as the nature of cyber threat intelligence suggests, it becomes relevant for certain types of business operations and can be even outsourced. As such the only remaining part of dissertation offers an abstract workflow of cyber threat intelligence practices without presenting much of an evidence as to their benefits for SME.

#### **Reviewer 2**

An interesting dissertation topic and angle, which holds much promise. The student identifies a nice niche and should be commended for that. Its basis in recent, empirical developments shows great awareness of the subject area on the part of the student. I very much like the presentation of the empirical data and the straightforward, clear writing style. There are some fundamental issues at hand, however. The literature review, while nicely structured, is absent of much of the literature such that there is quite sparse review of the relevant, academic, peer-reviewed literature. Granted many of the issues examined are very 'new', but all the more reason to leverage what has been said in the literature around parallel issues and leverage this as the basis of your contribution to the literature.

With regard to the methodology, it is somewhat basic, but the plan to attain primary evidence from local Glasgow SMEs is to be commended. The fact that this couldn't happen has no bearing on this dissertation or final grade. This difficulty aside, there is still a need to always explicate the methodology; it is achieved to a good degree, but could have been improved.

The proceeding empirical analysis is instructive and on point, however, it is not linked to SMEs, conceptually, to the required standard. Granted, again, the primary analysis could not be carried out, but the connection still needs to be made more strongly with reference to existing studies. Overall, it is a good dissertation performed in difficult circumstances and was an interesting read.