



# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

**Supervisor:** Ing. Josef Kokeš, Ph.D.  
**Student:** Martin Urbanec  
**Thesis title:** Wikipedia: Defense Against Vandalism  
**Branch / specialization:** Computer Security and Information technology  
**Created on:** 30 December 2023

## Evaluation criteria

### 1. Fulfillment of the assignment

- ▶ [1] assignment fulfilled
- [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
- [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
- [4] assignment not fulfilled

### 2. Main written part

90/100 (A)

The text of the thesis starts off with a very detailed explanation of Wikipedia, both in the past and today. That's necessary to fully understand the antivandalism techniques proposed later in the thesis, but might actually be too detailed - overall, the thesis seems somewhat unbalanced, favoring the detailed analysis of the current state of Wikipedia over the suggestions for the future. It's not too obvious and certainly does not significantly detract from the quality of the text, but it is noticeable. On the other hand, it means the description can certainly be used for more Wikipedia-related works, not just this one.

Other than that, I have few complaints. Articles (particularly the definite articles) are often missing, but the text is clear and accurate, the reasoning is convincing, and the formal aspects of the work are fine.

### 3. Non-written part, attachments

50/100 (E)

It seems a mistake was made when submitting the thesis to the system, because the provided archive does not contain the contents of the DATA folder. As a result, the non-written part cannot be properly evaluated as it consists only of the infrequent code fragments directly within the text and the processed data in Appendices A-C. I have a reason to believe that the conclusions from the thesis are reliable but unfortunately that cannot be independently verified easily.

#### **4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards**

90 /100 (A)

The results of the thesis tend to confirm past experience with the Wikipedia projects and provide insights into dealing with vandalism in the future. I believe they will prove to be beneficial to the project. Some significant work remains to be done - implementing the proposals (that should be fairly easy), determining the actual values for the proposed techniques (that might be challenging because each language branch will need to do it on its own) and particularly convincing the individual Wikipedias to actually start using them (I suspect this will be the most difficult part). Still, the foundations have already been laid, and even if the work was not actually used, its initial research of the current state of Wikipedia provides a valuable resource for similar works in the future.

#### **5. Activity of the student**

- ▶ [1] excellent activity
- [2] very good activity
- [3] average activity
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
- [5] insufficient activity

#### **6. Self-reliance of the student**

- ▶ [1] excellent self-reliance
- [2] very good self-reliance
- [3] average self-reliance
- [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
- [5] insufficient self-reliance

### **The overall evaluation**

85 /100 (B)

The thesis is a well researched work that provides insights into the options for dealing with the problem of vandalism in Wikipedia. Several techniques that might help solving it were proposed and evaluated on real data, with focus on effectiveness and efficiency as well as, very importantly, on their compatibility with Wikipedia's core principles. I believe there is a lot of potential for the practical application of the results. Only the incomplete contents of the submitted attachment prevent me from recommending the highest grade.

## **Instructions**

### **Fulfillment of the assignment**

Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently. In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

### **Main written part**

Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies?

Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 52/2021, Art. 3.

Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

### **Non-written part, attachments**

Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

### **Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards**

Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

### **Activity of the student**

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations.

### **Self-reliance of the student**

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

### **The overall evaluation**

Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.