Munkh-Orgil Batbayar

Opponent-style review (based on opponensi_lap_en.pdf form)

Thesis: *Detecting Platform-Induced Polarization Risk in Human Sentiment Interpretation: An OAM-Based Validation System for Twitter (X), Facebook, and Instagram*

> **Important limitation:** I did **not** run an external similarity/plagiarism scan (e.g., Turnitin) or check external sources. The "AI/plagiarism" judgement below is therefore based **only on what is inside the thesis text** and on internal coherence.

---

0) Use of AI & suspected plagiarism (integrity check)

What the thesis claims about AI use (good practice)

- The author explicitly documents using **ChatGPT** for **planning, drafting/language refinement, and Python debugging support**, while stating it was **not** used to generate empirical data or replace the author's own implementation and judgement.
- AI use is presented as **bounded**, with **author responsibility** emphasized and transparency supported via annex documentation (LLM-use table / prompt–response samples).

Risk signals / what to check (recommended)

- The writing style appears **highly templated and "framework-heavy"**

(many structured claims, repeated compliance-style phrasing). This is not proof of plagiarism, but it is a **typical AI-assisted drafting signature**; it warrants verification.

- Several parts (e.g., utilities/cost-benefit reasoning, extensive methodology scaffolding) can be **over-polished** relative to typical BSc prose; again, not proof—just a reason to **audit provenance**.

Integrity conclusion (based on text only)

- **No direct internal evidence** of plagiarism is visible from the thesis' own disclosures and documentation structure; AI use is **declared and bounded**.
- **Recommendation:** run a formal similarity report + spot-check: (a) "literature review" paragraphs, (b) methodology explanations (COCO/Y0), (c) any "institutional requirement" quotations, (d) the most polished sections.

---

1) Topic & Objectives — max 40 points

Strengths

- Topic is **current and relevant**: cross-platform differences in **human sentiment interpretation** and "polarization risk" framing across **X/Twitter, Facebook, Instagram**.
- Objectives are **clearly operationalized**: four research questions (RQ1–RQ4), two hypotheses (H1–H2), and explicit task list tied to deliverables (workflow + testing + outputs).
- Scope is realistically bounded as a **workbook + automation prototype**, with future deployment explicitly deferred.

Weaknesses / improvement points

- The construct "**platform-induced polarization risk**" is inherently slippery; the thesis should ensure the **definition and measurement boundary** is kept consistently narrow (risk in interpretation variance, not societal

polarization causality).

Score: 34 / 40

---

2) Review of the Literature — max 40 points

Strengths

- Literature chapter is broad and structured: testing/reproducibility, objectivity/validity, KPIs, platform context, annotation reliability, OAM/COCO background, gap analysis.
- The thesis includes a **gap statement** (A–D) and aligns sources to the methodological choices, not just a "dump."
- References appear extensive (incl. a coverage matrix / categorized bibliography).

Weaknesses / improvement points

- Risk of **over-citation without deep synthesis**: broad coverage can become "decorative" unless each cluster is explicitly tied to the method and measures used.
- Some sources are **institutional / methodological framework** references; that's acceptable for compliance, but the thesis should ensure the *core scientific argument* is anchored in strong peer-reviewed work as well.

Score: 32 / 40

---

3) Presentation of the Author's Own Work — max 60 points

Strengths (this is the thesis' main value)

- Clear “own development” contribution: an **Excel-centered analytical system** supported by **Python automation**, with a well-defined workflow from raw survey export to decision output.
- Empirical basis is explicit: **100 respondents**, **15 posts**, Likert-scale ratings (5 posts per platform).
- Dual-branch analysis is well articulated: **COCO-STD structural layer** + **COCO-Y0 deviation layer**, integrated into a final output logic with cross-branch convergence checks.
- Strong engineering discipline: input validation, artifact generation (PDF/JSON/CSV), structured run logs, and systematic testing (reproducibility, perturbation, sensitivity, negative validation).
- Privacy awareness: GDPR-minded data minimization and anonymized data handling are addressed.

Weaknesses / improvement points

- Sampling limitations matter: reported sample bias (e.g., heavy Instagram usage share) can influence platform comparisons; the thesis should be careful not to overgeneralize.
- The “risk” indicator interpretation would benefit from a tighter justification of *why* the chosen metrics correspond to “polarization risk” rather than generic dispersion/instability.

Score: 52 / 60

---

4) Structure, Style, and Formal Aspects — max 40 points

Strengths

- Very clear structure (Intro → Literature → Own developments → Discussion → Conclusions → Future → Annexes) and explicit rationale for the structure.
- Strong formal apparatus: annexes for abbreviations, figures/tables,

references, reproducibility artifacts, AI-use documentation, definitions/ethics boundaries.

Weaknesses / improvement points

- Likely **verbosity and "framework language"** overhead: some parts may feel more like compliance documentation than a scientific narrative; tightening would improve readability and credibility.

Score: 34 / 40

---

5) Overall Impression — max 20 points

Overall

- The thesis appears **substantive, reproducible, and development-centered**, with clear evidence of systematic workflow thinking and testing discipline.
- The strongest contribution is the **implemented validation pipeline** (not just results).
- Main cautions: interpretive boundary of "polarization risk," sample bias/generalizability, and formal verification for AI/plagiarism.

Score: 16 / 20

Final score (out of 200) and grade band

- Topic & Objectives: **34/40**
- Literature: **32/40**
- Own Work: **52/60**

- Structure/Formal: **34/40**
- Overall: **16/20**

✅ **Total: 168 / 200 → "Good" (160–179)** according to the form's scale.

Quick actionable recommendations (for defense / final submission)

1. Add a **1-paragraph "construct boundary"**: what "polarization risk" means *in this thesis* and what it explicitly does *not* mean.
2. Include a short **validity paragraph**: how post selection + respondent mix may bias results, and what would change with stratified sampling.
3. Provide (or point to) **reproducibility evidence** clearly: where the code, workbook template, and run logs are, and what an examiner can reproduce in 15 minutes.
4. Run and attach (or be ready to discuss) a **plagiarism/similarity report** and show the annexed AI prompts as provenance evidence.

If you want, I can also produce a **filled-in "Opponent's evaluation form" text** (ready to paste into your template) with a short "General summary" paragraph and the point table exactly aligned to the form headings.