



School of Computer Science and Engineering

BCI2001 – Data Privacy

Project – J Component

- As per my earlier instructions in classes, for project component, the existing algorithms / measures can be reviewed and gaps can be identified. Solutions for the problems can be suggested.
- I have uploaded in my google drive few review articles and some articles about anonymization techniques, which can be used to narrow down your topic of interest.
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/17QK7-wT6XzDAHgZQTp4WGxiMvCBqfCyL?usp=sharing>
You can then search for more research article of your interest in <http://egateway.vit.ac.in/>
You can use your VIT email id as username and mention you have forgot password then follow the instructions to login into the system.
[many papers downloaded from google may not be of good quality to start your project]
Go through the papers of your interest. Then choose a particular algorithm / technique / model proposed by an author. Go through future works mentioned by those authors and work on those.
- After discussing with me you can prepare an article based on your project. We can submit it to a journal / conference based on the novelty and your contribution.;ioupi

1. Review 1 [20 Marks]

Presentation can be given any time between 10 am and 5 pm during 16th - 20th January 2022.

Venue: SJT 213 – a33

Rubrics for assessment procedure is provided in Annexure I

Minimum of 2 page document with Motivation, aim, introduction, literature survey and references. At least 10 research articles has to be mentioned in the references which is cited in introduction or literature survey.

Student should print this document and carry it for conducting review-1.

2. Review 2 [30 Marks]

Presentation can be given any time between 10 am and 5 pm during 6th – 10th March 2022.

Venue: SJT 213 – a33

Rubrics for assessment procedure is provided in Annexure I

Minimum of 3 page document with Abstract, proposed model and references. At least 20 research articles has to be mentioned in the references which is cited in proposed model by citing, the proposed is better than existing methods.

Student should print this document and carry it for conducting review-2.

3. Review 3 [50 Marks]

Presentation can be given any time between 10 am and 5 pm during 3rd – 7th April 2022.

Venue: SJT 213 – a33

Rubrics for assessment procedure is provided in Annexure I

Minimum of 10 page document with Abstract, introduction, literature review, proposed model, empirical study, experimental analysis and references. At least 20 research articles has to be mentioned in the references which is cited in article.

Student should print this document and carry it for conducting review-3, which has to be uploaded in VTop.

Annexure-I
Rubrics for evaluation

First Review (Weightage – 20%)

Indicator	Weightage	Poor (0 – 25%)	Fair (26 – 50%)	Better (51 – 75%)	Excellent (76 – 100%)
Ability to articulate the problem and identify objectives	20	Lacks clarity in defining the objective and problem statement	Problem statement is clear but objectives not in line with problem statement	Problem statement is clear and objectives are not completely defined	Problem statement is clear and objectives are well-defined

Second Review (Weightage – 30%)

Indicator	Weightage	Poor (0 – 25%)	Fair (26 – 50%)	Better (51 – 75%)	Excellent (76 – 100%)
Ability to demonstrate the right use of technology to achieve the identified objectives	5	Ability to use right technology is poor	Ability to demonstrate the right use of technology is fair	Ability to demonstrate the right use of technology is moderate	Ability to demonstrate the right use of technology is exemplary
Ability to identify and compare related technologies that can be used to realise the identified objectives	10	Not able to state any related technologies	Able to identify the	Able to identify the related technologies, but not able to compare them	Able to identify and compare the related technologies
Ability in self-evaluation and learn from mistakes	5	Not able to self-evaluate	Able to self-evaluate but not able to realise the mistakes	Able to self-evaluate and also to realise the mistakes	Able to self-evaluate, realise the mistakes and learn from mistakes through alternate solutions
Ability to use the basics of science to explain the engineering principles and the technology used	10	Ability to explain is very poor	Ability to explain is moderate	Ability to explain is good	Ability to explain is excellent

Third Review (Weightage – 50%)

Indicator	Weightage	Poor (0 – 25%)	Fair (26 – 50%)	Good (51 – 75%)	Excellent (76 – 100%)
Submission of draft project report and poster [1] Quality of draft project report [2] Quality of experiment [3] Abiding to the format [4] Submission within the due date	10	Satisfied any one of the indicated parameters	Satisfies two of the indicated parameters	Satisfies three of the indicated parameters	Satisfies all the four indicated parameters
Continuous engagement (evident through discussions) in learning and work ethics	5	Both continuous engagement and work ethics is not up to the satisfactory level	Displays moderate level of work ethics as well as engagement level in continuous learning	Displays good work ethics and medium level of engagement in continuous learning	Has good work ethics and takes every opportunity to result in effective learning
Quantum and quality of the project work	10	Lacking in both quantum as well as quality of the work	One of the parameter is satisfactory while other is not	Both quantum and quality of the work is satisfactory and the effort put in the learning is moderate	Quantum and quality of the work is exceptional. The effort put in the learning aspect is very evident
Effective communication [1] Fluency in oral communication [2] Preparation of presentation material [3] Body language	5	Not satisfactory in all the three parameters	Effective in atleast one of the three parameters	Effective in atleast two parameters	Effective in all the defined parameters
Technical aspects [1] ability to use the right methodology to describe the results [2] ability to discuss the results obtained and to defend the questions from the panel regarding technical aspects [3] ability to relate the findings to further developments / to solve social issues	20	Not satisfactory in all the three parameters	Effective in atleast one of the three parameters	Effective in atleast two parameters	Effective in all the defined parameters