

OPPONENT RECORD

Thesis compiled by

MIRAN ALI and VLADAN NIKOLIC

Title of thesis:

Silverfish Simulation

Opponent:

PETTER SALMINEN

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

In matter of fact, I found it hard to understand the underlying purpose of the project.

But I do believe that it is either only to get a Bachelor's Degree, or in fact that the writers of the thesis thought that this experiment would be fun to compile.

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

Yes. I do consider that the title justly reflects the contents, as matter of fact. The content is just about "Silverfish Simulation" although in a very unworldly simulation-world.

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

There was a very brief introduction, that concisely told about what silverfish are, and a short problem statement.

There was also a very brief touch on the matter of simulation techniques, but more about them came later on in the paper.

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

I think that the whole silverfish simulation was kinda strange. As they did not paint up the premises of the world of the silverfish before reading all the way to the end of the "Method" part.

Although the method of tackling the problem, that is building a simulator and simulate with it seems to be all by the book.

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

Not as I can agree on. As reading from up down, one can not understand all the prerequisites easily. Although the method itself might been discussed to great extent, the simulation world of the silverfish was not to enough of a degree I would say.

Is the method adequately described?

The method itself was quite simple, so it was adequately described in the report. Also, there was a good helping flowchart to understand their method fully.

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

The results are very clear, although I would rather have seen more details on this, as much of the detail space is lost in the histograms, because of the one-sidedness of the results.

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

Due to the fact that the world painted up to us seems to me be a very simple fantasy world with a set number of prerequisites so yes. I think that this could instead been proven with Math instead of using a simulator. Such as Markov processes, or maybe even normal probability theory.

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

One of the four bibliographies seemed relevant. Where as two of them were pictures of silverfish, and the first one a very short page about Silverfish written in 1996. I would even consider a text on silverfish from Wikipedia to be more relevant I guess.

Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?

One text in the introduction on 2.2. was noted as extremely difficult to understand. Mostly because the meaning is too long and poorly constructed.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

It would be nice if they added a Glossary, and also a little text on the fantasy world of these silverfish in beforehand, so that it would be easier to understand the text as sometimes it is presumed that one knows facts that only are to be stated below in the text.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

It is very simple, easy to understand what they have done, what their results are and why these results are as follows.

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

I got bothered by the text a few times, especially as some parts are more written as an author of a book, than a scientific paper. Example as "...murdered by foot", "...brave silverfish" and "...in the heat of battle"

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

I would actually estimate the news value as nothing. There is nothing of value for the general media from this report.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

Paint up a fictional simple world of silverfish, set a few prerequisites for the world. Then build a simulator for this world, and see if the "Brave" silverfish or the "Cowardly" silverfish will prevail in the evolutionary line.

Then get results that points out that the silverfish that feign death ("brave") ones one-sidedly will develop and in the end, be the only silverfish left living.

Then a small set of discussion after these results about them.

The report itself needs a better introduction, talk about a little what it is going to simulate and the rules of the "circle of life" in beforehand. And needs to rewrite part 2.2. as it is almost impossible to read. And the visualisation of the data as histograms could maybe be visualised better, since the results are so one-sided.

Questions to author:

- 1. *Who invented this fictional silverfish world, from where are some of the prerequisites taken, such as that other silverfish know they have fled and thus being shun by in their society?***

- 2. *Was your bibliography really needed? Are two pictures of silverfish really needed in the report, and is the 'factsheet' from Eric Day really that important?***

- 3. *Are you really serious on the part that when you say that you're not suggesting that one should draw conclusions of favourable behaviour for humans from the report. Do you actually think anyone would?***

- 4. *Your citing for the "Eric Day" site does not mention "starchy foods" as a word itself. Do you consider the reader to know what this term means by itself? Why not instead just add a glossary or write examples?***

- 5. *Have you tried experimenting with the numbers, so that the results might not get so onesided towards "cowardice" as the ultimate defence for silverfish?***

- 6. *How does the program choose with silverfish to go out from the hide-out? I don't think this was ever mentioned although I might be wrong.***