

Warsaw, 9th of September 2010

Dear Prof. Dr. Debora Weber-Wulff,

We are proud to take part in your Plagiarism Detection Software Test for the third time.

However before we can allow the tests to begin we would like to draw your attention to those aspects of our program that we believe have been misunderstood in the last round of tests.

In your report concerning our System you write: "Sobald ein Teil in einer Quelle gefunden wurde, wird danach in anderen Quellen nicht mehr gesucht". This is not the case, our System finds all the sources that contain fragments similar to the one in the text, however, only the longest is shown in the report. This solution was implemented as the longest similar fragment is considered the most likely to be relevant to the document under analysis.

A further misunderstanding, we believe, has resulted in your test 0 and 30, both texts that were supposedly free from plagiarism. Our system was poorly marked because it found a similarity, despite the text being original. This is a misunderstanding, the Strikeplagiarism System finds all the similarities in the analyzed document including correctly introduced citations. The fragments that were found were not only short phrases that are popularly used (test 30, frag. 2 and 3) but a long phrase (test 30, frag. 1) and a real citation (test 0). We feel we should not be downgraded for a function that the System was especially designed to do. It is, furthermore our belief that plagiarism detection software cannot replace human work and it is the educator who must decide whether the document is in fact a plagiarism or not. It is, as we stress on our webpage and in our instruction documents only a tool that makes the educators work easier. Our conscious decision was to highlight all similarities.

The sources that have been found to contain similarities to the text are listed in the Similarity Report. There are two types of lists, one shows the longest fragments, the others identify the types of sources the fragments were found in (a University database, available for University clients, or the internet). The list containing the longest fragments seems to have been misunderstood in your report from 2008 (<http://plagiat.htw-berlin.de/software/2008/bewertung/s06-strikeplagiarism/>), the list is designed to show up to 10 of the longest parts of the document that show a similarity to the source documents. These fragments can come from the same source, as they did in the document you mention, however this is not an error of our System, but an attempt at drawing the User's attention to those parts that are most likely to be copied. Furthermore you mention that the "Mark the fragments" or "Fragmente markieren" link does not work, this was likely to be a temporary error.

From your description of our Free for plagiarism Certificate it can be deduced that any User, whose paper was analyzed in the Antiplagiarism System receives such a Certificate. This is not the case, as has been mentioned, our primary customers are educational institutions that are attempting to detect a student who presents a paper under a false pretence. We therefore introduced a Free from Plagiarism certificate to promote effective plagiarism control procedures. We believe that delivering a computer System is not enough to combat the mentality of the cheater. Universities that have put specific procedures into place that guarantee the effectiveness of the plagiarism control are awarded the Certificate. Students of these universities will receive a Certificate once their paper has been cleared.

As regards the layout of the User account, described in “Layout und Beschriftungen” of the Usability table. We are aware that the account may be considered cumbersome, our system was originally designed to aid educators in the fight against plagiarism and although the accounts have evolved since many of the original solutions designed to easily browse and select documents from a large database have been retained. However it is now possible to search for a document without using the % signs, which was necessary two years ago as you show in the report (screenshot2- <http://plagiat.htw-berlin.de/software/2008/bewertung/s06-strikeplagiarism/>).

Lastly we would like to underline that we lead a strict document security policy. Documents uploaded to the account of an individual User are not made available to anyone. Documents uploaded to University accounts can be made available to other Users within a strictly controlled program and only once the User who uploaded the document gives consent.

As a contribution to the quality of the tests we would like to suggest that you test how plagiarism detection software reacts to long documents. Our System has been developed in such a way as to most effectively analyze long text documents such as thesis papers. We believe that this is our added value.

Yours sincerely,

Sebastian Kawczyński Ph. D.