



**KTH Computer Science  
and Communication**

Kerstin Frenckner, tel 08-790 9754, e-mail: kfrenck@csc.kth.se2

February 12, 2009

Copyright CSC, KTH

## 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** Andreas Wedenborn

**Title of thesis:** Dolt i det öppna

**Opponent:** Daniel Langesten

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

The purpose was easy to understand since the "Syfte" paragraph was written very short and informative. What could be improved is that the author could add a reason to his purpose, because as it is now it is missing.

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

The report title fits the project very well, although it does not give you any information of what the project is about. And because of that I do not think that it reflects the contents of the report. I think it is more suitable to say that it arouses the readers curiosity for the report.

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

Since this a comparison study, the relevant background is the material gathered for comparison and all of this is told of in the literature summary of the report. There is also an introduction in the report which informs the reader of how steganography (the current topic of the report) has been used throughout history and also how and why one might want to use it in today.

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

The author really did not justify the choice of method to tackle the problem. Neither did he go into detail of how he would perform the method. He just briefly announce that he will analyze the texts without telling us how he will do it. There is not a paragraph to clarify his method either. You need to read the purpose paragraph to get information of the method. And this paragraph is very short and limited which results in almost no description of the method.

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

No he did not discuss the prerequisites he just tells the reader what he will do and nothing more.

## **Is the method adequately described?**

Yes it is. Although it is very short and not very thorough. The author very shortly tells us what he will do. Its shortness would I consider a problem because it does not give the reader an idea of how the author actually will perform his research.

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

Yes he has. He firstly summarize what he tried to do and if he succeeded. After that he moves on to tell the reader about his results and conclusions. In his discussion he writes "*Synonymutbyte ser jag som den mest intressanta metod av de ovan diskuterade metoder. Mest kanske för att jag ser mest potential I den.*" and that leads us to a thing I think is missing from the results, the author does not motivate why he sees the biggest potential in the "synonymbank" case.

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

I think the authors conclusions is credible since he motivates his conclusions in a sensible way. But I think it misses some important parts. One of these is why he thinks the synonym exchange method has the biggest potential. He just tells the reader that he think it has. But never why. The thing we do get to know is the strengths he sees in it.

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

The literature and references are highly relevant for the chosen topic. But there is not very much variation of sources. The facts are taken mainly from texts written three different writers. The two other sources used in the project is a lexicon for Swedish synonyms and wikipedia. The one mentioned last also seems a little unfitting for a bachelors thesis.

**Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?**

The whole report was written in a way which was very easy to understand and it felt like you could always follow his line of argument. The part that was lacking a bit was the description of the method as I already mentioned before.

**Other comments on the report and its structure.**

The author could split the introduction part to two parts. One of which is an introduction to the topic and catches the readers attention and one that is actual background which you need to know to understand the rest of the report. Now you can not be sure if you actually need to read everything there to understand the later discussion.

**What are the stronger features of the work/report?**

The stronger features of this project is the explanation of different methods of steganography and that the report goes into details of how it works.

**What are the weaker features of the work/report?**

There is not as many sources for the project as one might want to have. There is also at least one spelling error (ugn where it should say ung). Also the "Syfte" paragraph is very short and does not give the reader all the information needed as I have already stated before.

The sentences are also phrased in a very confusing way. One example from 4. Diskussion:

*“Synonymutbytet är den mest intressanta delen av den lingvistiska steganografin, enligt mig. Även den som har störst potential.”*

The second sentence begins in a bad way and need to be rephrased to clarify what the author actually means. For example it could say: ... enligt mig. **Det är** även den som har störst potential (**enligt mig**).

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

I do not think that it is worth a whole lot since the report only discusses work already done. Though it is useful in the way that it summarizes the topic very well and thereby saves the reader a lot of time that otherwise would be spent on research. It also provides a little insight and ideas for continued exploration of the topic.

#### **Summarize the work in a few lines.**

An easy understandable summary of what steganography is. Also it is informative of how and why steganography is used today. This is done by discussing three different modern steganography techniques. In the discussion it focuses on bringing up pros and cons of the techniques and also the author tells us of the uses he can identify for them in modern society.

**Questions to author:**

1. Du skriver att synonymutbytet är metoden med störst potential. Dock skriver du inte vad den har för potential utan diskuterar bara dess styrkor. Vad är det som ger den sådan potential?

2. Du påstår att dessa tre metoder du beskriver i din rapport är de man kommer över om man läser in sig på ämnet lingvistisk steganografi. Finns det inga andra metoder?

3. Tror du att steganografi kommer vara praktiskt användbart till vardags.

4. Du nämner att en av mimicrys stora fördelar är att det går att automatisera. Är det inte så att styrkan ligger i att man i nuläget redan har ett system för att automatisera det eller är andra metoder omöjliga att automatisera?

5.

6.