How reliable is the algorithm-based network segregation? Can the colors be interpreted as referring to different factions? Are the interactions well-represented in the network?
THREAD ANALYSIS

Thread data manual collection, starting from the users that appear in the algorithm-based network

Tagging: user | archives | thread title | user comments | other users in the same thread | each user comment in a specific thread | total comments per thread.

Threads with one comment: edit explanation
Threads with two comments: edit explanation and others users relative agreement

Identification of: the most commented threads, threads with the highest number of participants, user that has made the highest number of comments (overall), user that has made the highest number of comments (in a single thread), users’ co-participation in threads

NETWORK STUDY

Identification of the most active users
- According to manually collected data
- Looking at the algorithm-based network

Analysis of the discussions with the highest participation of the chosen-users and the highest number of different users’ comments.

Analysed threads: Ambiguous phrase | PVO issues | “Claims of counter conspiracy” renamed | Funding | Removing distorted quote
Interactions between users: sometimes answers do not follow the structural rules. Users cite each other (both, with or without link), or just answer with a new comment. In this way, the algorithm misses the connections.

The interactions are mainly discussions between users. In a few cases there is a simple agreement about the edits done, in other cases there is a request of more explanations.

Central users:
Nieglj appears in different discussions (15 in total), in which different users had taken part (12/15 of the main users). However, he did not comment a lot in each thread (mainly 1 comment, 23 comments overall). NewsAndEventGuy appears in many discussions (20), in which different users had taken part (9/15). He commented a lot and in four discussions he did more than five comments, fourteen in one (58 comments overall). Dmcq appears in different discussions (13), in which different users had taken part (8/15), that are almost the same in which NewsAndEventsGuy had taken part. He commented a lot. In five discussions he did more than five comments (42 comments overall).

While Nieglj seems to be more central from the point of view of the potential users with which he comes in contact, NewsAndEventsGuy and Dmcq are central the “level of discussion”: more comments on a single thread could easily be synonymous with more discussion. It might be interesting to evaluate the level of "debate willingness" of each user, looking at the ratio between the number of comments each user does and the number of conversations in which she/he participates. However, sometimes the same user writes many comments in the same thread but with the specific purpose of explaining what she/he has edited/meant to say. Probably it could be good to consider the number of participants per thread too.

Users could be divided into factions according to two different parameters:
1. Depending on their position on the article’s topic (In this case, if they think global warming is or is not a conspiracy).
2. Depending on the opinion they are supporting in a particular thread.

In the first case, all users try not to overexpose their opinion about the topic, saying they are acting in order to “have an article with a neutral POV and respectful of Wikipedia policy”. Someone’s position is easier to understand from what they are supporting and the way they are acting. The
position of other users is less clear. These users sometimes enter the discussions trying to bring order, they agree partially with both parties, or just with one but with a more quiet attitude. Generally, they have a third position on the thread but their opinion around the topic lies more hidden.

In the second case, the position of each user depends on the threads. It is not possible to put users into a specific faction because of the threads’ diversity (even if the threads mainly revolve around POV and article neutrality). Quite often, links to Wikipedia policies and rules are used as arguments.

Regarding color assignment, neither of the two cases can justify the colors assigned by the algorithm. In my opinion, an overall position could make sense only if related to the general topic of the Wikipedia article, that would be interesting to detect. The problem is that some users do not show their position that much and its evaluation can always be contested. Even assigning a position to the most explicit users is risky, since they do not disclose it with absolute clarity. Everyone (and especially users themselves) could question this assumption. From the readings of some threads, I could assign to an approximately true position NewsAndEventsGuy, Phase_Theory, 86.**_IP.

I think assigning faction colors according to the threads is rather difficult. Each thread has a different topic and the same users do not always stay in the same faction.