Creative ideas, however, descriptions are shallow, a bit too high-level (you only utilized around half of the word limit, clearly you could have added more details), and some aspects are unclear. As a general comment, you pose too many questions per idea, which renders the ideas as lacking focus.

Idea 1:

Analyzing failures and setbacks in human wayfinding. Humans are in general surprisingly good at navigating wikipedia given only the local information of each page. However, sometimes they fail to find a path between the starting and the target page causing them to restart the game or click back to a page they visited before. It would be interesting to understand what goes wrong in such cases and why navigation fails. Is there always a link between semantically related articles? Does semantic distance always correlate with the graph distance? Are players approaching a solution when they quit? Does it happen only in cases where the shortest path is long or also in games where the optimum solution is short? What kind of strategies do players follow in these cases?

- Interesting idea. Questions: (1) How would you identify why did the navigation actually fail: I would have appreciated a discussion on some ideas around this. (2) How would you compute semantic relatedness and distance between articles? (3) Lastly, “What kind of strategies do players follow in these cases?”, which cases are you referring to here, you talk about two cases in the previous sentence and its unclear which case is exactly being referred to in the last sentence.

Idea 2:

Understanding hubs. High degree nodes are essential for playing the game for humans as they allow navigation between unrelated concepts. When evaluating shortest paths algorithmically however they do not appear in the optimal solutions. What are these articles about? What is the threshold for considering a node as a hub? In which category do they belong to and how do they relate to other articles? Do they lead to optimal solutions? Can humans achieve optimal solutions without visiting them?

- Interesting idea, but the questions that you pose seem to be quite descriptive. Also, hub is standard terminology in the field of network science, and I would implore you to look into https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hub_(network_science) and the citations therein to come up with a definition of Hub in this dataset. Lastly, some of these questions have already been studied in this paper: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2187836.2187920. It would be great if you go through it and try to find novel analysis that you can do.

Idea 3:

Understanding how the structure of the page affects strategies. Players play the game by trying to find links between the articles. Sometimes these links are at the top of the article or at a prominent place on the page but in other cases they might be “hidden” under many paragraphs and players have to scroll down a lot to find them. It would be interesting to check how this influences the selection of links. Do the players miss “good” links or even the target page because of the position? Where are the hubs located at the page?

- Neat idea. Questions: (1) Are you aware of these papers: (a) http://dimitardimitrov.info/documents/pp1382-dimitrov.pdf and (b) http://dimitardimitrov.info/documents/OpenSym2016_EvaluatingWikipedia.pdf? It seems that your idea is somewhat similar to theirs, and I would encourage you to identify differences, if any. This will help you identify what new question you plan to answer. (2) You just know the links that were clicked, but don’t know their position in the HTML. How would you identify that? According to the guidelines provided in the Wikipedia manual of style, a target article may be linked only the first time it is mentioned in the source article, but these are just guidelines, and an article might be linked more than once from a given article. These cases might be limited, however, I would encourage you to think about if and how you want to deal with them.