

OPPONENT RECORD

Thesis compiled by: David Karlbom & Thomas Sjöholm

Title of thesis: Replicating the Emotions of a Facial Expression on a Furhat Robot Face Using a Kinect Input

Opponent: Josefin Agerblad

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

The introduction felt a bit scattered, it had some excess information, and it wasn't clear from the beginning what that information had to do with their report. The problem statement, however, was very clear and precise.

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

It definitely does. The title might be a bit too long, but at least it gives a clear understanding of what the report is going to be about.

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

Like I already mentioned, the first introduction had some excess information, which nonetheless gave a more colorful backstory to the report. The background was good, it explained how facial expressions work and also discussed the Kinect well. However, I would have liked a more detailed explanation on how Furhat works.

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

They explained their method pretty thoroughly, but did not justify their mapping algorithm at all. They did however, justify their type of survey. They understood the human limitations of defining what a certain facial expression is supposed to look like and took that into account when creating the survey.

Is the method adequately described?

The method to create and execute the survey is well described, but the method of implementing the mapping algorithm is not. They describe how the whole process works, but fail to explain how they figured out how to implement the mapping algorithm.

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

There are two clear tables that show the most important results, which I think are great and really helpful. More detailed results can be viewed in the appendix, which I also think is great. To conclude, the presenting of the results is done very well.

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

They presented their results well, but their conclusion lacked reasons as to why the results looked the way they did, that was something I really felt was missing. They did, however, show great understanding of what limitations their equipment had, and how that influenced the results.

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

They used many references, some seemed a bit unnecessary, like the Charles Darwin one, but most of them seemed relevant. There were many webpages which I personally feel might not be as serious as a book or a scientific report, but I do understand that it must be difficult to find actual books on the subject, considering this is a pretty new technology.

Which sections of the report were difficult to understand?

I thought the section with the title "Runtime" was a bit difficult to understand at times. It was a lot of information crammed into one page, and the fact that English is not their first language was noticeable, and made it more difficult to read.

Other comments on the report and its structure.

Overall, I thought it was a good report. It was interesting and they presented their results in a really good way. However, some parts were more difficult to understand, like the "Runtime" section that I mentioned above. But the overall structure, was easy to follow, with clear headings and sub-headings.

What are the stronger features of the work/report?

The way they presented their results, and the effort they put into the survey, are what I believe to be the strong points of this report.

What are the weaker features of the work/report?

The conclusion really needed some more work; it felt more like a repetition/summary of the results.

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

Their research was not really ground-breaking, so I doubt it has great news value. It was however interesting for someone like, who did not know a lot on the subject before reading this report.

Summarize the work in a few lines.

The report is about seeing how well the Furhat can replicate the facial expression of a real person photographed by the Kinect camera. How well the replication was, was determined by surveying a number of people.

Questions to author:

1. Would you have gotten better results if you had used a different camera than the Kinect?
2. If you'd had more time, would you have wanted to develop Furhat further, to improve the replicating? And how would you have done that?