



Computer Science

Opponents:

Marie Högkvist

Rickard Johansson

Respondents:

María Dolores Salmerón Pérez

Jesús Daniel Moreno Arques

**Media database with web interface
for local history society**

Improvements of the previous system

1 A General Evaluation of the Project

The work performed during this project has been successful in adding functionality to the previous system. The respondents approach to the problems, as well as the previous system, is easy to follow. Parts of the project even have step by step instructions that can be found within the dissertation. There are some mistakes made in the dissertation but overall a well-performed project.

2 Comments on the Project in Relation to the Dissertation

The dissertation reflects the project that was undertaken. The information within the dissertation follows the different parts of the development done during the project and stays relevant and on topic.

2.1 Title

The title of the dissertation gives a clear picture of the topics contained within. An improvement might be to make the subtitle "improvement of the precious system" a bit bigger as it can be easily over looked and perhaps add a part to it that explains that an analysis of the previous system is also handled as well as the improvement.

2.2 Dissertation Layout

The layout of the report is well spaced which makes it easy to read, with no page being over cramped with text. In addition the text is also nicely broken up by the many figures and tables that are contained within the report.

2.3 Scientific Method

Most of the dissertation seems well put together from a scientific point of view. The respondents have tried to gather what data they can on the different parts comprising the project. However, there are some factual errors in the text as well as in one case giving

statistical backings to a claim where the relevance of the statistics to the claim is questionable. These errors should be corrected as they decrease the credibility of the result.

2.4 Argumentation and Conclusions

The argumentation is generally well made, with stated reasons and arguments for most choices made. There is however some problems with the argumentation being vague on some parts such as how the respondents arrived at the number of picture storage services that exists online which in turn makes these conclusions feel less reliable.

We would suggest clarifying the arguments so that the conclusions would not feel any less reliable than any other part of the dissertation

2.5 The Abstract

Two clarifications are needed to increase the understanding of the abstract: *How* anyone can access all information (through a web application), and *what kind* of commercial alternatives that have been analysed (online media storage).

Apart from these clarifications, the abstract gives the reader a good overview of the project and what the dissertation is about.

2.6 Language Aspects

In general, it has been easy to understand what the authors want to express to the reader. However, there are some sentence structures that are hard to understand and that we have needed a few read-throughs to understand. We think that the dissertation would therefore benefit from being proof read by someone with a good skill in the English language.

2.7 References and Sources

The authors are using a wide variety of relevant references and sources; however the level of quality of the dissertation would increase by adding additional references as some references are missing.

In the reference list, a short description of the website addresses listed would be useful to the reader. (As done on for example reference 14.)

In chapter 1, a source to Nyeds hembygdsförening is missing.

In section 2.2.1, there are several sources missing (MySQL AB, Sun Microsystems, Oracle Corporation, GNU General Public Licence, Wikipedia, Google, Drupal, Facebook)

In section 2.3, the source of the statement “millions of hosting photographs services online may be found” is missing.

In section 2.3.2, source number 16 should be moved from “standards [16] of behaviour” to “standards of behaviour [16]”.

In the last paragraph of section 2.3.2, appendix number is missing in the appendix reference.

On page 31, a reference seems to be missing (“¡Error! No se la encuentra el origen de la referencia.”)

2.8 General Comments on the Project

We are concerned about some factual errors made in the background research of the project. We also would have liked to have had a better overview on the existing system (that this project was a continuation of) to be able to compare the end result of this project with what already existed. With the exception of these two points we think that the project has been well-executed and the end result has been successful.

3 Chapter by Chapter Evaluation of the Dissertation

3.1 Chapter 1

It would be nice to have a translation of “Nyeds hembygdsförening”, similar to the one in chapter 2, page 3 (the Local History Association of Nyed.)

In the chapter overview (section 1.2), the overview of the chapters (“sections”) is difficult to read as all the chapter descriptions have been written in one paragraph. Different paragraphs for the different chapter descriptions would be easier to read.

In the description for chapter 4 (“It contains a detailed explanation about the different levels of items: priority items, low priority items and extra items”), it is unclear what type of item that is referred. A clarification is needed.

3.2 Chapter 2

Chapter 2 is well structured, which makes the flow easy to follow. The information is relevant and useful to the reader, and gives a very good background of the project.

Missing in chapter 2 is a section dedicated to the previously developed system in terms of functionality and GUI. All updates and changes are linked to the existing system and it is an important part of the background that is not being explained.

In section 2.2.2, we question what the authors mean with the sentence “PHP is installed in more than 20 million websites and servers in a million” as it is hard to understand and after checking the reference (Wikipedia) it is also incorrect, as the source material states that it is actually 20 million *domains* hosted by *servers with PHP installed*.

The second paragraph in section 2.3 needs to be rephrased as it is confusing. The parenthesis is not a correct parenthesis, and the sentence contradicts itself as it both states that nine different systems have been selected for discussion and that four of the systems are going to be discussed.

When the tools of Flickr are listed in section 2.3.2, the tool “make stuff” brings questions, as the term sounds non-scientific. Is it a term that comes from Flickr or is it the respondents choice of words? If it is a term from Flickr, it would be good with a clarification. If it is the respondents choice of words, we suggest finding a better synonym for “make stuff”.

In the third paragraph of section 2.3.2, it is stated that subscribers to pro accounts have storage space and unlimited bandwidth. It is unclear if free accounts have storage space and if so, how large this storage space is.

In section 2.3.4, it is unclear if payment accounts in photobucket support windows xp publisher or if they are locked to ftp.

Table 2, with corresponding Figure (Figure 4), is incorrect. If we have 4000 pictures at one Mb per picture this will result in 4Gb worth of pictures, which is greater than 2Gb (not lesser than). In addition, 6000 Mb is deemed lesser than 2Gb in one part of the table but greater than 2Gb in another part. This table and its corresponding figure should be looked over once more.

3.3 Chapter 3

Chapter 3 has a clear structure and comes together as a whole. The step-by-step instructions are easy to follow.

In the first paragraph on page 17, problems with the search functionality are addressed and it is suggested that more picture data should be used for the search matches. It would be good

to have a section describing the data linked to the picture. Is there any more data that could be used in the search that is not being used?

In section 3.2.1.6, it is explained how a picture can be linked to a geographic location in Panoramio. After the link “Map this photo” is clicked, how is the picture mapped?

Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 feels like appendices and should maybe be made into such. If these are altered, 3.2.3 should be updated to reflect the change.

Finally, we wonder if the title of chapter 3 (Experiment/Implementation) explains the content of the chapter or if another title (for example “Problem description and database alternatives”) would be more informative to the reader.

3.4 Chapter 4

Chapter 4 is well-written. Our only question is about items, which there are some references to (for example “item S4” on page 30 and “item A1” on page 32) that we have not been able to find the explanation of in the dissertation. We are unsure if these items are linked to the solutions listed in section 3.1.2 or if the authors mean something else? A clarification of this is needed!

3.5 Chapter 5

The content of chapter 5 is good. However, all content are located under the same section (5.1, Existing project and learning curve) which makes it hard to quickly get an overview of the information in the chapter. Dividing the chapter into sections would make it easier for the reader. Items are once again referenced (“item S4” and “item N4” on page 47), without an explanation of what the definition of these items are. This needs to be clarified, as the meanings of these items are lost to the reader.

3.6 Chapter 6

Chapter 6 shortly sums up the project as well as the dissertation. The respondents present their goal of making an easy to use user interface in this chapter. While it would have benefited the reader to have this information - in conjuncture to what parts of the existing system where already working well - earlier in the text, it does not detract from the chapter or the dissertation in general.

3.7 General Comments on the Dissertation

The dissertation is interesting and easy to read. Unfortunately the overall impression is dampened by the language of the dissertation and some factual errors. If these are corrected, the level of quality of the dissertation would be increased greatly.

4 Final Comments

An interesting subject and the project overall seems to have gone well.