OPPOSITION FOR MASTER'S PROJECT

The duties of an opponent are to:

- Critically review the report in question

- Pay particular attention to the problem approach, the methodology chosen and to the interpretation/evaluation of results

- Make annotations on the report of clerical errors, other minor errors, incomprehensible or ambiguous text

- Complete this Opponent Record (use a computer or black ink)

- In advance – at the time stipulated – give this record to the persons stipulated in the instructions for your exjobb subject.

- Orally present your general opinion of and comments on the work during about 5 minutes after the author's presentation of the work

- Put questions to the author of the report following his/her presentation: you may put forward the questions set down in the Opponent Record, or some of these questions, but it is also reasonable to expect the presentation to generate new questions.

- Give the Opponent Record and the annotated report to the author at the conclusion of the seminar

You may contact the person responsible for the degree project, e.g. to test programs.

The Opponent Record can be completed either using a computer or manually. If writing by hand, use red or black ink and write distinctly. The Record copies must be legible but not necessarily aesthetically pleasing.

Master's projects vary considerably. Consequently, at times not all of the questions will be relevant to the project you are opposing. It can be appropriate to rephrase the questions to fit the project. You may also introduce one or two additional questions.

Attempt to answer the questions in the Opponent Record in relative detail. Answers such as **Yes** and **Good** are insufficient.

OPPONENT RECORD

Thesis compiled by

  Jonas af Sandeberg

Title of thesis:

  Riksdagsval via Internet

Opponent:

  Christian Wemstad

Was it easy to understand the underlying purpose of the project? Comments.

I think that the purpose was very obvious. There is a clear connection between the introduction and the result and discussion. The abstract is a good summary of the important parts of the essay.

Do you consider that the report title justly reflects the contents of the report?

Yes, the title clearly states that the essay is about Internet voting in general elections. The subtitle then further explains the essay is about how to safely use Internet as a platform for voting in Sweden.

How did the author describe the project background? Was there an introduction and general survey of this area?

Since the essay is not built on any own implementation or testing a voting system most of the essay contains of the background. The connection to reality was good and there were no problems in seeing and understating how a system like this could be used in Sweden and how it would affect the voting system.

To what degree did the author justify his/her choice of method of tackling the problem?

In the beginning of the essay the author clearly states that the goal of the essay is to, in theory, design an Internet platform for voting. He also state that this will be done by going through and evaluating systems that are in use today as well as other existing functions.

In the essay the author the states different functions that could be used for the main purpose and how they will help in getting there. Further, the author explains different areas where similar systems have been used and how those systems work.

In the end a custom designed system is delivered

Did the author discuss the extent to which the prerequisites for the application of such a method are fulfilled?

The author clearly states that his method is strictly theoretical and that no implementation is done. Nevertheless, in the discussion phase he brings up different fact to back up his theses and design. He also states that since the main focus in the essay lies in selecting which methods and functions that could be used.

Is the method adequately described?

There was no direct method described.

Has the author set out his/her results clearly and concisely?

The author clearly states his results in the beginning of part 2 of the document. It is concisely presented and a discussion regarding these results follows.

Do you consider the author's conclusions to be credible?

The author conclusion is that it is possible and a theoretical design is presented all the methods that are used in the design are presented earlier in the essay.

Based on the data presented in the essay his conclusion is valid.

What is your opinion of the bibliography? What types of literature are included? Do you feel they are relevant?

Included in the essay is a bibliography. Since this area is quite new to the world it is understandable that most of the literature is websites, despite this it is clear that the author has made a great effort in finding websites that are known to be good sources, such as different departments at the Swedish government and different banks in Sweden. Some efforts in finding other sources can also be spotted since there is one source that is a book.

Every entry in the bibliography is relevant; they are well connected to their specific paragraph and add makes it easy for the reader to see where that information came from.

Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?

In section 3.3 Hashfunktioner some grammatical and structural flaws made this section hard to understand. This error only occurs in this section and should have been spotted in the proof reading.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

The essays structure is overall very good and easy to understand. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to see how the different parts in the design were chosen. What made some methods better the others? and so forth.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

The strongest features is each when you read each sub chapter by it self. E.g. every method in chapter 3 is very clearly explained on a level that is suitable for the essay. Focus on these methods has

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

The biggest weakness that was found in the essay was that the connection between the different technics in section 3 and prior used systems in section 4. Sometimes in sections 4 it was hard to

understand what technics and methods from section 3 that were used. This might be because the data from the literature dose not state this. If it is so, it should be clear in the essay that this is the case. Otherwise it would be interesting to get this data presented.

What is your estimation of the news value of the work?

There is some news value in the work presented. Although the abstraction level of the design is quite high the essay still stats that an implementation of the Internet platform for voting in Sweden is possible. There is a clear connection to technology already in use in Sweden making a transfer to a system like this even more likely.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

A good and well-composed essay with a clear purpose and goal. An interesting subject

Questions to author:

1. Vad tror du är huvudanledningen till att vi idag inte har ett system som detta i Sverige idag.

2. Används dessa system endast i Schweiz och Estland. Om inte, varför valde du att ha med just dessa 2 länder?

3. Vad gjorde att du valde den design som du nu använde? Finns det andra och isf varför valde du bort dem?

4.

5.

6.