NUS
National University
of Singapore

26 August 2024

Mr Rishav Chourasia
(A0206936Y)
c/o School of Computing
NUS

Dear Mr Chourasia

PHD THESIS PROPOSAL (CP6010)

I am pleased to inform you that you have successfully passed your PhD Thesis Proposal review.

The examiners have provided some comments for you to improve on your research work. Please consult your advisor on the necessary areas of improvement for your PhD research.

Yours sincerely

Chan Mun Choon
Professor and Vice Dean
Graduate Studies

cc   Professor Xiao Xiaokui, Advisor, Dept. of Computer Science

EXAMINERS' COMMENTS
PHD QUALIFYING EXAMINATION – RISHAV CHOURASIA

Reviewer 1:

[Depth of proposal (adequate scope for PhD?)]
There are already more than enough results for graduation, let alone passing TP. I'm not an expert in privacy, but at least from my viewpoint, the chapters all seem to be of very high quality, to an extent far beyond the typical thesis I have encountered. I very much appreciate the priority of quality (rather than just quantity) and the clearly high degree of research independence.

[Originality]
Very original results. For example, instead of trying to refine composition-based analyses, a completely different approach was taken based on analysing differential equations associated with Langevin dynamics. The results on Machine Unlearning also seem to be a very welcome rigorous approach, as I understand that the area has often been more purely experimental/heuristic.

[Literature Survey Sufficiency]
I don't know the privacy literature extensively, but the related work covered seems to be very good. Currently there is no 'Related Work' section as such, and it's instead spread throughout other sections. Having a specific section (possibly separately within each chapter) could make it more focused and easier to locate. Also consider whether to use numbered citations, which might be easier for a thesis.
(These suggestions are optional.)

[Technical Details (correctness, reproducibility)]
I can't speak for line-by-line correctness, but it does appear to me that a lot of care and rigor has been taken. I'm only entering '4' due to my limited knowledge, and I may give more specific comments when it comes to the final thesis.

[Presentation]
The presentation was generally very good -- well-spoken and well-paced, and a good balance of material. The time taken was a bit longer than expected (but reasonable), and sometimes the notation got a bit heavier than ideal. Question answering was all excellent.

Reviewer 2:

[Depth of proposal (adequate scope for PhD?)]
Proposed work is adequate for a PhD.

[Originality]
Good amount of originality present.

[Literature Survey Sufficiency]
Relevant work seems to have been taken into account and compared against.

[Technical Details (correctness, reproducibility)]
Technical approach seems sound and appropriate.

[Presentation]
Presentation was good in general. More detail would have been beneficial, but probably not feasible given the time limit.