

# Opposition on thesis report

## Thesis

*Title:* Connecting Silos: Automation system for thesis processing in Canvas and DiVA

*Authors:* Qi Li and Shiva Besharat Pour

*Reviewing student:* Juan Luis Ruiz-Tagle ([jlrto@kth.se](mailto:jlrto@kth.se))

## Contents of the opposition

### Abstract

Very detailed abstract, one gets an accurate overview of the whole project. A whole page is too long. The idea of an abstract is to provide with a short description of the research being done and its results. It is complete, but I think that the information could be compressed a bit more.

### Introduction

The introduction gives a general idea of the topic, and the situation regarding thesis-management at KTH. However, some of the different elements of the whole introduction chapter (goal statement in first paragraph *"The aim is to provide increased efficiency, increased accuracy, and reduce the time and effort needed by all involved"*, problem statement in background *"Currently, automation is lacking when it comes to connecting Canvas to other digital platforms"*).

### Subject and problem area

Reader understands the relationship between Diva and Canvas, and the explanations are backed with data sources.

### Problem discussion and aim

Problem is stated clearly in the form of a question. However, the thesis is supposed to have a research dimension, and the problem statement as it is doesn't really reflect it, since it sounds a little bit abstract. Instead of "How can approved student theses submitted via Canvas be automatically entered into DiVA?" I would rephrase it as "How can the amount of time taken to publish a thesis in DiVA diminish?". Time is something measurable, as it is later described in the conclusions. In the Purpose section you sort of repeat the problem aim. This section is supposed to reflect the purpose of the report, not the project thesis. That is, describe problems and present the results. Goals and deliverables are achievable and achieved in fact.

### Boundaries

The delimitations of the project are stated and justified. Impossibility to access to DiVA API.

### Disposition

The different parts of the thesis and its structure are well presented in this section.

## Method

The chosen study approach is appropriate. Many tests are done and passed to check the system's success, which is good. A validation a reliability study is performed. Maybe the theoretical description of the methodology could be improved.

## Data collection and interpreting material (Data analysis)

Performance improvement on time spent for thesis publication. The deliverables are properly defined (the system and the MODS file).

## Results

## Conclusions and Discussion

The limitations to the study are discussed. The authors reflect properly upon the social, economical and ethical considerations of the project, with relevant comments. Specific proposals for future work are presented.

## References

Plenty of references are used in the text, so it's contents are supported by many reliable sources. Some of the references could have more quality.

## Language and technical performance

Some minor typos and mistakes throughout the report. I suggest to maybe run the text through a spelling checker like Grammarly to correct the mistakes. The whole report is very extensive, and the authors describe accurately every single component or package involved in the project. The style used in the text is formal and cohesive during the whole report.

## Honesty and critical distance

The opinions of the authors are easily distinguishable from the statements backed with bibliography.

## General impression

My general impression is that the project was properly executed, addressing and solving a real problem existing at KTH. The deliverables can even be useful for the teachers to publish new thesis. The document itself could have been structured better, but still can be read and understood properly. The research question can be formulated a little bit better.