Questions for simon

Implementing the API – cross origin, access headers etc

Printing the dissertation, suggested time and cut off? Poster?

Lit Review

~~- you mention augmentation rather than argumentation.~~

- perhaps needs a sub-section on existing argumentation mining software (only Margot really springs to mind but do a quick search to see what is available publicly as things might have changed since you started this project). Show what I’ve looked into, justifies why argumentation mining is in future work. May not be specific to my project but relevant. Include requirements for this and other things, cover all bases in the requirements.

Software Engineering Section

- Generally needs to be expanded I think. Aim to fully document your software artefact and the process that has produced it.

~~- Perhaps this chapter, before the requirements analysis, might start with some user stories? i.e. "Thom is analysing text from articles in The Guardian and Independent newspapers to identify the range of periodic sentences found in each. His goal is to compare the kinds of argument and reasoning that are used in each. He uses the periodic sentence detection web interface to ...” - or something along these lines. It gives specifics and helps you to build a mental model of how the tool might be used.~~

~~- Nees an introductory paragraph before 3.1 that introduces the chapter.~~

- 3.1: Your requirements also come from the background research don’t they? What about other argument mining tools? - even though not doing exactly the same as yours they may have features that can contribute to your requirements analysis and give a more complete account.

~~- 3.1.1 It feels weird to reference the future work section here when you’re talking about things you are doing now. Instead you could suggest that there is a longer term/wider goal of general applicability to web-sourced text but that a smaller initial scope has been chosen for this specific project.~~

~~- 90% seems like a number plucked from nowhere. I’d personally set the bar much lower as a first target, i.e. can we do better than random, e.g. get the correct result in >50% of cases?~~

~~- Requirements should be presented in a table. Each individual requirement should be given a unique ID but they otherwise don’t need to be organised. Table should be organised, at minimum with ID | Requirement (Single sentence using words such as should/shall (not) | place for further comment on motivation or explanation. NB. The requirements are then usually prioritised through a MoSCoW analysis to show which sub-sets are developed in which order (and which are out-of-scope or left for future work).~~

~~-3.3 - not a repeat of tech review. Might cover similar ground, but now from the perspective of “what did I do” rather than “what can I do/use”. Also, give details, If you talk about implementing an algorithm then show the algorithm, give pseudocode and discuss what it does and how.~~

~~-3.4 - For each requirement there should be a corresponding test (e.g. blackbox/unit-test) which verifies that what you said you’d do does what you intended~~

Experiments Section

~~- 4.2 - give examples, and be specific.~~ How large is the dataset, ~~how is it structured/organised, give an example of a specific record in the data so that the reader know what they would get if they opened a file to look at it.~~

- Figures all need accompanying text and explanation