



**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: André Flykt, Nermin Cirgic

Title of thesis: Mandatfördelning i Sverige

Opponent: James Huang

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

The underlying purpose is very clear and there is no room for misinterpretation.

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

Yes, the report title justly reflects the report's contents.

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

The project background is well described. There is an in-depth introduction into the topic area and the general survey is very detailed. The wording of the introduction however can at best be described as confusing. Reading about Swedish Electoral distributions in the report just makes me more confused, not less.

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

This question is not applicable for this type of thesis project. This project studies allocation of representation in a political representative assembly. Thus, there is only one available method, the one proscribed in law.

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

The nature of this report precludes the selection of alternate methods. The entirety of the report is focused on an alteration of an existing method.

Is the method adequately described?

Most likely yes. However, I find the disposition of the essay confusing. There is too much raw data, and it is presented in a form that makes reading it and getting an overview and predisposition confusing. The essay does not describe the electoral appropriation in enough detail for a layperson to understand.

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

The problem with this essay is not the amount or clarity of the data but rather the sheer bulk of raw data. It seems that the data is presented in the form of tables, almost exclusively whereas charts and diagrams would have provided a better overview. Also, the sheer amount of raw tabular data is a good candidate for inclusion in an appendix, instead of taking up the bulk of the main text as it does now.

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

Yes. However, I might mention that this essay is more about the study of a method. The conclusion is rather the different sets of data resulting from the alternation of the method's parameters.

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

The bibliography seems to consist of valid sources. The sources seem very relevant upon a cursory inspection. However, I question the inclusion of what seems to be exclusively online sources. Maybe some first hand interviews and some offline sources in the form of publications should have been included?

Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?

The language of the report needs work. The English version of the abstract definitely has grammatical and linguistical errors. Within the report, some parts of the introduction show clear grammatical and syntactical inconsistencies. A review of the language and tone of the overall essay is required.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

The structure of the report needs work. The report contains too much bulk statistics and not enough diagrams and/or charts to explain a topic of this complexity. A lot of the raw data currently in the text should belong in appendixes. The introduction of the text seems a bit broad. Do we really need a whole section devoted to a single political party?

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

The report is mostly easy to read and easy to understand. The readability of the report is not affected by the linguistic inconsistencies in some sections of the report.

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

The sheer amount of raw statistics without supporting charts and/or diagrams detracts from the overall readability of the report. Charts and diagrams should definitely have been included and the sheer bulk of the data should have been included in appendixes.

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

An alteration in allocation of seats available for political representation would make for interesting reading for only a small subset of the mainstream readership. The report would probably be interesting reading for political observers and students of political science and politics. Then again, given the nature of these calculations, this audience might very well already have made the calculations on their own.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

This report is a study of the Swedish electoral system. It attempts to study the effects of the alteration of the number of seats has on overall fairness in proportional representation. Its conclusion is that addition of more seats results in a more fair and proportional parliament.

Questions to author:

1. Why is there so much raw data in the main text?
2. The text seems incoherent in some sections. Did you have adequate time to proofread?
3. Does the topic of Swedish proportional representation interest you? Why did you choose this topic?