

Assignment 4

Hendrik Werner s4549775

April 22, 2017

1 Feedback Bram Zandt

Feedback for	Bram Zandt
Exercise	3
Feedback from	Hendrik Werner

1.1 Target Audience

You say that the target audience are mathematicians and computer scientists. I agree with that. Later you say that \equiv and *mod* are only understandable by computer scientists. This contradicts your earlier point. As far as I know both of these are mathematical symbols and don't have anything to do with Informatics per se.

Your reasoning (apart from that) is sound though, and I agree with your conclusion.

1.2 Message

You only discuss RSA being used as a signature algorithm but the article is also concerned with its use to establish public-key cryptosystems. It's a good idea to mention the "comparison" to traditional media. I am not sure if "comparison" is the right word though, as the article wants to take some properties of the old system and apply it to the new one.

1.3 Effectiveness

I agree that the abstract is too long and detailed, while the introduction is too short. The point about the "comparison" against traditional media applies here as well.

2 Feedback Stephanie van Gogh

Feedback for	Stephanie van Gogh
Exercise	3
Feedback from	Hendrik Werner

You did not include the paper you chose. We were supposed to do this. I was able to find the article with the link you provided after logging in; but the abstract and introduction are not labeled and I did not really know where they are.

At first I thought the gray text was the abstract but that does not appear to be the case, as this switches to the normal, black text mid-sentence.

All in all I was not able to give good feedback for this exercise because the article you chose does not appear to be a scientific article, but an article from a magazine. I could not apply the necessary structure to that article.

3 Feedback Thijs klein Baltink

Feedback for	Thijs klein Baltink
Exercise	3
Feedback from	Hendrik Werner

3.1 Target Audience

I fully agree with your conclusion what the target audience is; but you did not provide any reasoning for that conclusion. To me it's pretty clear because of all the acronyms used, etc. You should probably mention it anyway.

3.2 Message

I agree with the author's message you worked out. You wrote it down very concisely, but still mention all the relevant information. Very well done.

3.3 Effectiveness

Again, I agree that the abstract is way too detailed and contains too much information that distracts from the actually important content. However, ironically, this is also true for your answer. I think the whole second paragraph of your answer could have been reduced to 1 or 2 sentences.

4 Feedback Timo Schrijvers

Feedback for	Timo Schrijvers
Exercise	3
Feedback from	Hendrik Werner

4.1 Target Audience

I mostly agree with what you make out to be the target audience. Apart from the word "efficiently" I cannot find any evidence backing your claim that one needs to know about complexity, however. If this is really that important to the article at a later point, the authors should not have neglected to mention that.

4.2 Message

You worked out the same message as I did so I agree with that; but you did so in a very long winded manner. You begin by paraphrasing big chunks of the article, then mention the message.

Probably because you got distracted by that you made the core message a bit vague. My answer would be "The core message is that DNA-computing techniques can be applied to traditionally hard algorithmic problems." or something like that with some evidence.

4.3 Effectiveness

I agree with your conclusion and the evidence you provided but again, I think it's unnecessary and distracting to paraphrase the article in between that. This makes your answer longer and buries the important information without a benefit (that I can see).

5 Feedback Yorick Pelt

Feedback for	Yorick Pelt
Exercise	3
Feedback from	Hendrik Werner

Your exercise was the best one I had to give feedback for. Really well done ✓. Therefore I could not add very much, sorry for that.

5.1 Target Audience

I agree that the target audience can now be assumed to be more general than initially intended; and with the reasoning given for why the article is still to this new audience.

5.2 Message

I have nothing to add, I fully agree.

5.3 Effectiveness

I agree with your conclusions. I also think that the article is more difficult to read than necessary because the concepts are explained well but the structure is very strange. I did not make the connection with "stylometrie" myself, and it could be a very good explanation for why this is the case. Very interesting thought.