

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2686635 DCU 233481 Charles 722530
Dissertation Title	Cyber Warning Intelligence: Enhancing Predictive Capabilities in Cyberspace. A Comparative Study of the American and Italian Cases

<p>Word Count Penalty (1-15% over/under = 1 gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)</p> <p>Word Count: 24,141 Suggested Penalty: no penalty</p>		

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

Final Agreed Mark: A5 [18]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Excellent
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Very Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Very Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Excellent
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Very Good
B. Use of Source Material	
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>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Excellent
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Excellent
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	
• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Excellent
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Excellent
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Excellent
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| • Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology) | Not required |
| • Appropriate word count | Yes |

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

The dissertation intends to investigate cyber warning intelligence systems. Two cases are analyzed, with the main focus being on the Italian case. The U.S. case is considered to be the etalon. The research was challenging for two reasons – there is not much information on the intersection between cybersecurity and intelligence. The conceptual framework is robust and draws on the debate on the so-called Fifth Domain. This serves as an appropriate springboard for the discussion about warning mechanisms. An early warning systems is designed in the analytical part by analyzing secondary literature on the U.S. experience. The presented analysis is persuasive, and the Italian context makes it interesting. Overall, a well-written dissertation on a nuanced topic.

Reviewer 2

I very much liked this dissertation, though did not fully appreciate its strengths until I got to chapter 3. I think there is a bit of meandering before it reaches this crescendo, where the author comes up with ideal points for cyber warning systems. I think this dissertation would have earned a higher mark if the authors took some time early on to discuss better the interplay between government and private sector actors and carried this interplay more fully throughout the project. In short, figuring out who does what and governmental obligations (see the case of Israel in future research where this is better defined) might have structured the dissertation better—it really takes until p 20-21 to get to a solid discussion on this—I also think the early part of the work is overly reliant on the work of Maness et al and not enough of the author's own voice comes through. But the evaluative case study is exceptionally well thought out—America disappears a bit, although mentioned early. Do look more at the Israeli case if pursuing future research.