

CO885 – Workshop 3
“How to structure a dissertation?”
Rogério de Lemos

Participative exercise: structure analysis of three dissertations

- ❑ The goal of this exercise is for you to analyse and compare the structure of MSc dissertations.
- ❑ From the 10 MSc dissertations available on Moodle, select any 3 of the dissertations, and for each dissertation, evaluate and comment on the points below.
- ❑ Towards the end of the workshop, several submitted evaluations will be compared and discussed.
- ❑ This is an individual effort, and the analyses of 3 MSc dissertation should be submitted on Moodle using this form
- ❑ Deadline: 16pm on the day of the workshop

This is an individual submission:

Name	Login	Which MSc?
Pierre-Marie DANIEAU	Prld2	Advanced computer Sciences (computational intelligence)

Dissertation 1:

Title of dissertation	An educational tool for writing proofs in C0884
Author	Maxime Merlin

[1: not at all, 2: not really, 3: just enough, 4: very good, 5: exceptional]

Overall presentation [1-5, justify]:

4 – The document seems fine. The text is justified, spaced, airy, useful illustrations. Some pages could have been more filled.

Organisation of preliminary and end material [1-5, justify]:

2 - Title, Abstract are here. There's no list of figures (tables or abv) no Content page nor Acknowledgment. But there's no needs of them. The Main body starts right after the Intro. It need a little bit more of explanation i.m.o. References are here. Appendix : half of the appendix are useless.

Abstract is clear, concise and informative [1-5, justify]:

1 – The abstract in this paper is more of an introduction than an abstract. It make the plan and doesn't expose the conclusion or anything.

Key chapters of the main body are clearly identified [1-5, justify]:

3 – Chapter 5 is too long. Beside this the key chapters of the main body are here, well exploited.

Each chapter contains introduction and conclusion [1-5, justify]:

4 – Some are missing but most of them are here, well described and present.

Each chapter is well organised in terms of sections and subsections [1-5, justify]:

4 – The chapter is too long. It could have been split in two or three different chapters.

References are clearly laid out, and appear to be complete [1-5, justify]:

4 Some references should be exposed as Literature review. But since they are mostly documentation about a specific language, they are well listed, the source is here, the date and the author too.

Appendices are well organised [1-5 or not applicable, justify]:

4 – Each page contains One appendix which is good even if half of it is useless.

Dissertation 2:

Title of dissertation	Web Application Privacy Manager
Author	Eric de la celle

[1: not at all, 2: not really, 3: just enough, 4: very good, 5: exceptional]

Overall presentation [1-5, justify]:

2 – The way the text is exposed is not good, the titles are too fancy. The text is too large. Not enough words (even if it takes 33 pages!). Not a good dissertation. I don't want to read it presented like this.

Organisation of preliminary and end material [1-5, justify]:

3 – The references are here but in the bottom of the page where it's used. Which is not good because if it's used somewhere else it will be cited twice. The appendices aren't really appendices. The preliminary are good !

Abstract is clear, concise and informative [1-5, justify]:

5 – Nothing to say, it's good.

Key chapters of the main body are clearly identified [1-5, justify]:

5 – good plan, everything is here, useful and purposeful.

Each chapter contains introduction and conclusion [1-5, justify]:

2 – Small introduction sometimes. One conclusion somewhere in the 5th chapter.

Each chapter is well organised in terms of sections and subsections [1-5, justify]:

5 – Everything is clear, logically organised and split.

References are clearly laid out, and appear to be complete [1-5, justify]:

1 – At the bottom of the page. Only a link to the source.

Appendices are well organised [1-5 or not applicable, justify]:

2 – This is not appendices... Plus there's more than one appendix on each pages.

Dissertation 3:

Title of dissertation	A Machine learning approach to detect insider threat in access control System
Author	Sara Alkindi

[1: not at all, 2: not really, 3: just enough, 4: very good, 5: exceptional]

Overall presentation [1-5, justify]:

2- Dissertation too long. The text is too big and airy. Too much word.

Organisation of preliminary and end material [1-5, justify]:

3 - Not in the good order but they're here. Appendices too long.

Abstract is clear, concise and informative [1-5, justify]:

2 – Not very clear, not very concise but informative. It's kinda blurry sometimes but I did understand the main topic without understanding the

Key chapters of the main body are clearly identified [1-5, justify]:

5 – Well organised. There's no background but it's alright. The methodology is well separated.

Each chapter contains introduction and conclusion [1-5, justify]:

4 – Conclusion is replaced by "summary" but it's enough to make a link to the next chapter.

Each chapter is well organised in terms of sections and subsections [1-5, justify]:

3 - I think there's too much sub-sub-sections but it's for sur well organised.

References are clearly laid out, and appear to be complete [1-5, justify]:

5 – Nothing to say, the job is done

Appendices are well organised [1-5 or not applicable, justify]:

1 – Way too long, too much information. Experiment could have been summarised instead of having screenshot of whatever the student used.