

# OPPONENT RECORD

**Thesis compiled by:**

Marcus Lundqvist, 890830-0273, marclun@kth.se

Daniel Hollsten, 910917-0895, hollste@kth.se

**Title of thesis:**

Robocup Soccer – An evaluation of artificial intelligence about the differences and similarities between real and simulated football teams on the field.

**Opponent:**

Alexander Wilczek, 901109-2914, awilczek@kth.se

**Was it easy to understand the underlying purpose of the project? Comments.**

Yes, the purpose of the project was both clear and easily understood for the most part. However, I would like to see some clarification in regards of the paragraph starting with “*One of the most significant purposes of this essay....*” In short, the purpose of the report, although still rather easily understood, could be more thoroughly explained. For example: Which specific factors and situations are they referring to? An example would easily shed some light on this. Alternatively, an example of such a situation could be specified in the problem statement, thus providing the reader with knowledge regarding such things in an earlier paragraph.

**Do you consider that the report title justly reflects the contents of the report?**

Yes, the title does indeed reflect the contents of the report in a proper fashion.

**How did the author describe the project background? Was there an introduction and general survey of this area?**

The background is clearly and concisely described in the paper. An introduction and description of the Robocup history is presented, however, it is not comprehensive enough to be classified as a general survey in my opinion.

**To what degree did the author justify his/her choice of method of tackling the problem?**

The authors did not particularly justify their choice of method, as far as I can tell they simply executed it without providing any justification as to why this particular method would provide the desired answers to the questions asked in the problem statement.

**Did the author discuss the extent to which the prerequisites for the application of such a method are fulfilled?**

No, however as far as I can tell no prerequisites were set for the method in question unless the actual literature requirement is considered as one. Should this be the case, I do believe the prerequisites to be fulfilled despite it not having been discussed.

**Is the method adequately described?**

Yes. The method is described in a manner that is easy to follow and to understand.

**Has the author set out his/her results clearly and concisely?**

No. While the results are discussed to some extent in both the discussion and conclusion chapters, they are never clearly defined and presented on their own. This makes it harder to distinguish the results from the discussion. I would recommend providing the reader with an additional chapter dedicated exclusively to the results without any particular discussion whatsoever. This would most likely provide the reader with enough clarity to follow the discussion and conclusion without any major problems arising.

**Do you consider the author's conclusions to be credible?**

Yes. Although I did not consider them to be particularly ground breaking nor surprising. The part regarding having made contributions to current literature however needs to be completely removed considering that the paper has not been published anywhere yet. There is no way to know that any actual contributions has been made to any current literature at all. However, one could argue that potential improvements have been made to already existing models, theories and methods.

Lastly, I thought the paragraph regarding future work was a nice finishing touch.

**What is your opinion of the bibliography? What types of literature are included? Do you feel they are relevant?**

I feel that while the bibliography is relevant, it is very confusing. The format varies as far as I can tell, sometimes the author is presented first with the title second, and sometimes it is vice versa. Furthermore, reference [8] for example fails to provide a way of actually finding the book or article. In short, while the references are indeed relevant I sometimes feel I would like some more information regarding where they actually come from.

**Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?**

None. This was actually one of the strong points in the report.

**Other comments on the report and its structure.**

The main thing I have to say about this report is that it is in dire need of a linguistic revision. Furthermore, there seem to have been some formatting issues, some letters seem to be closer to each other than others, making some words harder to read.

While the report is properly structured, the language and formatting unfortunately makes it hard to read sometimes.

**What are the stronger features of the work/report?**

First of all, it is very easily understood. Everything is thoroughly explained making both the method and reasoning easy to follow. Finally the simulated scenarios and theories are properly illustrated through proper usage of figures in various forms.

**What are the weaker features of the work/report?**

The language, the formatting and some of the formulations. This could be tended too by additional proof reading. Also, the parts regarding the contributions having been made to current literature need to either be removed or completely reworked as there is no proof of such a thing.

**What is your estimation of the news value of the work?**

As previously stated, the conclusions were not that surprising nor ground breaking in my opinion. While I do believe that it is a good report that is easy to follow and understand, I do not in fact think that it was all that innovative.

**Summarize the work in a few lines.**

As previously stated the report is indeed easy to understand and it is easy to follow the authors' train of thought. This is mainly thanks to the thorough explanations provided through the report but also due to the simplicity of the language.

However, the report does feel rather unfinished because of the lack of a results chapter as well as the errors in regards of language, formatting and formulating. Again, this could be tended to by additional proof reading. Furthermore, in section 4.2 a reference is required when stating that "*previous research has shown*".

All in all I do however consider it to be a rather good report, although in its current state I would describe it as somewhat of a diamond in the rough.

**Questions to author:**

At this time I currently have no questions for the author.