



**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:** Pawel Boniecki, Fredrik Ollinen Johansson

**Title of thesis:** The ability of iOS and Android multiplayer games to compete against multiplayer games on other systems

**Opponent:** Johan Nygren

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

Yes, while the background is rather short, the purpose of the whole project is reflected in the aptly named Purpose and Problem Statement sections at the beginning of the report. They are looking to compare how the mobile phone game industry measures up to the more traditional systems.

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

Most of it, I did not find that the multiplayer part of the title was heavily reflected in the contents, it could just as well have been about singleplayer games.

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

I think the background could have been heavily expanded upon. As it is now it is very short and only brings out a fragment of the material available should one look.

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

I found no real justification of the method in the report, but I doubt I would have done much differently had I written about the subject.

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

No, but I do not find it necessary.

**Is the method adequately described?**

The method is parted in two main parts, a questionnaire and interviews. The questionnaire is well described and documented but the interviews fall short. While highly relevant and informative, I get no understanding of how the actual interviews were performed or what the actual answers were (which I talk more about later).

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

The results of the questionnaire are showed in a very professional fashion that is easy to understand and follow. Every question is also discussed briefly in a good fashion.

The results of the interviews on the other hand are hard to follow and understand in some cases.

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

Yes, I very much do. I consider myself well versed on the subject and I completely agree and are able to see the points the authors are trying to make, but I do find them to fall a bit on the weak side. They do not mention their results in any particular way and I would have liked some references to specific questions in certain parts of the conclusions.

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

The inclusion of citations from an interview with Carmack early on in the report was highly relevant to the subject and while I have not heard about the Samsung game pad it made a lot of sense to mention considering the context.

I find the quote from Cevat Yerli a little bit hypocritical, he here praises the future of mobile gaming but he is known to think of games as being a media revolving around graphics, which is one of the fields that mobile gaming is currently behind at. But I can see how the perspective about the future is relevant to the report.

I like the bibliography and find it relevant to the subject.

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

Pros and Cons, pros and cons of what? I assume that they refer to mobile gaming, but still, it should be properly stated. Also, I have a hard time understanding if the text under Pros and Cons actual quotes from the interviews or summarisations. 4.3.4, I do not understand if that is still from the interviews or a summarisation of them as a whole.

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

The left alignment of the text makes it look less professional.

The abstract seems to only contain an explanation of the problem, no method, results or conclusions are mentioned.

The description in 1.4.3 of Video game consoles states "Video game console refers to any of the systems that is dedicated for playing games, but does not have their own screen built into the system". While this stands true for the systems later mentioned there are exceptions, for instance the newly released Wii U console has its own screen. The statement should be changed to either accommodate for this or changed as to say which specific systems are referred to and included in the report.

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

It is a really interesting subject, and the methods chosen to investigate the subject are the same ones I would have chosen. The authors also seem very interested in the subject.

The many interesting quotes by people who work in the industry.

The listing of the questions from the questionnaire, the graphs highly enlighten the answers and makes it really easy to understand.

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

Some questions are questionable. Particularly number four, since it was meant to only be answered by those who answered yes on number three. This skewed the results and perhaps it should be excluded or number three should have been reworded. The same goes for several of the following questions.

On page 21, the prospect of selling gaming equipment together with the mobile phone is mentioned; I would have like to hear a bit about N-Gage or something similar here or at some other part of the report as it is highly relevant to the background of the subject.

I would have been interested in knowing why people play certain consoles and when they chose to play mobile phone games. Do they play them at home regularly or do they like me only play mobile phone games while in transit to school or similar far away locations. This could have opened up a whole new array of discussions related to the subject.

I would have liked some of the discussion in the conclusions to talk more about the results of the questionnaire. As it is now I don't feel like they are connected.

The report is centred on multiplayer games but does not seem very concerned about this in either its discussions or conclusions.

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

I find the content of the report highly interesting and of a high news value considering how gaming is evolving in today's industry.

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

A very interesting read, I did enjoy reading it.

It is about how games on mobile phones can compete against games on other consoles. They did this by constructing and analysing the results of a questionnaire and interviewing a few people within the industry. The results later lead to a discussion and conclusion that the mobile phone game market share currently are not on the same level as the ones of the other medias, but in the future it might even overtake the others.

**Questions to author:**

- 1. How did you perform the interviews?**
- 2. Did you exclude any questions from the questionnaire or were they all included in the report?**
- 3. Why did you choose this subject, how do you find it relevant to your studies?**
- 4. If there is anything you could have added to the method, more interviews, additional questions in the questionnaire, what would it be? (What would you have liked to answer that you feel like you were not able to)**
- 5. Why did you choose to do the article in a multiplayer perspective?**
- 6. Concerning your results, is there anything that surprised you, or did you expect the results you got? (Mainly from the questionnaire, but also from the interviews)**